

CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC HEARING

DATE TAKEN: July 13, 2004
TIME: 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
PLACE: 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington

COURT REPORTER: Cindy J. Holley, CSR

PROCEEDINGS

MORRIS: Okay. Now we're moving into what we hope is going to be the concluding phase of a very long process to update our comprehensive land use plan that was initially written and adopted in 1994. It has been through a series of remand orders and adjustments to that initial 1994 plan and this is our ten-year update for it. Today we are anticipating testimony from the other jurisdictions in the county and those are jurisdictions who along with the County itself are responsible for developing a capital facilities plan to talk about how we are going to provide required public services for our new land use plan. And with that, Mr. Lee, we will begin with you.

LEE: Thank you, Commissioner Morris. My name is Patrick Lee, I'm Long-Range Planning Manager in the Community Development Department. On December 16th of 2003 the Board of County Commissioners continued the public hearing on the comprehensive growth management

plan ten-year review in order to allow additional work on capital facilities to be completed. The capital facilities analysis that was contained in your notebook was based on the land use map that the Board determined at the January 14th, 2004 work session. There have been no changes to that map since that point in time. The purpose of this hearing is for Cities and service providers to speak directly to the Board about their capital facilities planning and how it relates to the January 14th map.

On June 30th, Long-Range Planning electronically transmitted the capital facility summary report and the scheduled testimony for today to members of the technical advisory committee and other key staff suggesting that it would be appropriate to respond to the following questions at today's hearing. Do these submitted plans provide either new capital facilities or expansions to existing capital facilities sufficient to meet the adopted level-of-service standard when the demands from existing and expanded urban areas are considered. Alternatively, does the service provider propose a lowered level-of-service standard so that the provider can meet the demand from the existing and expanded area. Do these submitted plans primarily address the projected demand from existing and expanded urban areas with new or expanded capital facilities that are not funded in the first six years of the plan. And what are the primary sources of revenue that the service providers anticipate utilizing to fund the services.

I provided an overview of the capital facility summary report at last week's work session so I was not intending to repeat that today, but since preparation of the summary report we have received some new information and I did briefly want to review that for you. So the packets that I gave you contains information from Fire District Number 6 on top, behind the first green sheet will be information from the City of Battle Ground, and behind the second green sheet information from the City of Vancouver, and I briefly just want to review some of the key points in those documents.

In regards to the Fire District 6 transmittal I think the key points are starting on Page 2. At the top of Page 2 the District indicates the primary funding sources that it utilizes to provide its capital and operating services. In Section B there is a table identifying their existing stations capital facilities that they deal with. On Page 3 at the bottom under Subsection F the District indicates that its goal is to arrive at any emergency within our jurisdiction in less than five minutes and it provides some historical performance, how often they have met that. And on the top of Page 4 the District indicates that at this time it does not have plans in place to remodeling existing or constructing new facilities; however, the District has expressed concerns about Station 63 in the Salmon Creek area particularly with the conflicts with the transportation congestion that is experienced around there and how that could affect its ability to respond. So although they're not proposing any new capital facilities at this time, I think that will be a continuing area of discussion for the Board of Fire Commissioners.

If we go to the Battle Ground correspondence, there's actually about four pieces of correspondence that I would like to review. First on an E-mail from -- well, actually it's from Michael Mabrey to me who was in correspondence with the City of Battle Ground and the Battle Ground originating E-mail was there, they indicate that there was in fact a six-year sewer project list contained in the information or summary report, indicated it was not -- and that was an oversight on our part, but we do have the six-year capital facilities information. I think that they also provided some additional information on sewer and water facilities in Battle Ground and if you go to the second transmittal that we have in that batch, which is the information from the open house, the table that says "GROWTH MANAGEMENT UPDATE," I think a great deal more information is provided on both the six year and 20-year capital needs for the City of Battle Ground specifically for parks, sewers, stormwater and water, the six-year capital improvement costs are identified, the 20-year capital improvement costs are identified and the impact fee or system development charge estimate of what this would mean is identified. For transportation the information that is contained is the six-year

capital improvement cost, but we do not yet have 20 nor do we have what an estimate of the change in impact fee may be.

If we go to the third piece of correspondence, which is again an E-mail originally originating from Brian Carrico at the City which summarizes what the 6 and 20-year costs are for sewer, water, stormwater and parks, and I think also a very important point regarding the sewer costs the area south of 199th Street and west of SR-503, which basically includes the Meadow Glade area, is not included in those sewer costs. They indicate in this E-mail that they assume an additional 8.4 million may be required to provide sewer service in that geographic area. The --

MORRIS: Excuse me just a minute. Why would the City of Vancouver be providing sewer service to Meadow Glade?

LEE: No. Did I say, I'm sorry.

MORRIS: I think we were on the one from --

LEE: Oh, no. No.

MORRIS: -- Bryan Snodgrass.

LEE: No, no, no, from Brian Carrico, the City of Battle Ground.

MORRIS: Oh, I'm sorry, thank you. Thank you.

LEE: It's the July 12th E-mail.

MORRIS: Thank you.

LEE: We'll get to Bryan Snodgrass shortly. So I think under point 3 of Brian Carrico's correspondence they indicate the geographic limits of that sewer estimate. And also they submitted a new land use map, which is the final item in the Battle Ground package, that differs somewhat from the information that we use to develop the capital facilities analysis. We obviously have not had the opportunity yet to check and see if this makes a significant change in terms of the capacity estimates or some of the other analysis that we have done, but it is a new piece of information that the City of Battle Ground has submitted and I presume is kind of the basis of their ongoing discussion of capital facilities at this time.

Now if you want to turn over the last green colored page and go on to the City of Vancouver's correspondence, the additional information basically is captured in sort of the middle of that paragraph from the June 25th correspondence from Bryan Snodgrass. The police CFP they clarified does not end in 2008 as County staff had assumed, it just does not anticipate capital dollars for 2009, so the period of analysis goes through 2009. Vancouver has in fact tested intersections level-of-service downtown. They have an adopted CFP project list and they do acknowledge that they fully intend to adjust their transportation system plan to reflect any changes that may occur to 72nd Avenue or other road facilities based on the decisions of this Board. So that is a sort of a subsequent process, there currently is kind of a conflict between what's in their plan and what's in our plan.

MORRIS: Excuse me, Mr. Lee. Do they have level-of-service standards in downtown Vancouver then?

LEE: Yes, they do.

MORRIS: What are they?

LEE: Perhaps that best directed at representatives from the City. They have a corridor type of analysis as we do, although I believe some of their thresholds and travel speeds are a little bit lower in some instances. And the other point, and I did try and emphasize this, if you go to the attached May 20th memo from Laura Hudson to me, the third paragraph down, and again I tried to be very clear on this last week but I wanted to repeat it again today, the City's position is that for the longer term the City has the capacity, the taxing authority, to generate the revenues needed to meet the identified capital facilities needs, but does not currently have the mechanisms in place to ensure that they are available. And again, this is particularly relevant to the transportation information. And the Transportation Department in the City of Vancouver is working with a group of citizens to make recommendations to the City Council on how to address the longer term financing of needed improvements. But again they want to be clear that the financing ability is there, the mechanisms have not yet been decided on how they wish to tap into that financing ability.

In terms of the process (inaudible) that really concludes my presentation. We have the testimony from the service providers today. I would expect that any follow-up on capital facilities would best be brought back to this Board on August 3rd. And I would also indicate that certainly it is staff's intent to prepare a supplemental report that identifies the specific changes that will be made based on the comments that I just reviewed and additional comments that we may receive before the end of this month and bring that back to the Board in terms of the changes to the capital facilities report that you have reviewed at this point.

MORRIS: Any questions?

LEE: Any questions?

MORRIS: Thank you. I am glad to see the material from Fire District 6 and the additional material from Battle Ground, it was a little bit conspicuous by its absence. Okay. Do we have a sign-up sheet, Louise, for this? There's no sign-up sheet, okay.

RICHARDS: There is a sign-up sheet but no one signed it.

MORRIS: Well, okay. We'll begin then with the Town of Yacolt. And we are a little bit behind schedule but you have still a full 15 minutes.

SMITH: Good morning.

MORRIS: Good morning.

SMITH: I'm Debbie Smith, Town Council of Yacolt, I'm taking Jim Robertson's place, he's in Alaska fishing. That seems to be always be his story, isn't it. Yacolt began the process of updating its comprehensive plan in April of 2002. The Town Council discussed the purpose and scope of the Town's plan update and render decisions that set the stage for the planning tasks. Chief among these decisions was that the Town would not propose any expansion of its urban growth area or significantly change areas designated for various land uses within the UGA, anticipating only modest population growth and development as long as the community continues to be served by on-site wastewater management systems.

The first draft of Yacolt's comprehensive plan updated was published in September of 2003. It was

submitted to Clark County, the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development and nine other State agencies shortly thereafter. Changes were suggested which were addressed and in the final draft of the plan. In the current date -- in the current update of the Town's comprehensive plan was updated by the Town Council on March 15th, 2004 and submitted to Clark County on April 16th of 2004. The plan recognizes that the community will continue to be served by individual on-site septic systems at least until a next update of the plan, a method of wastewater management that does not accommodate development at urban densities.

The overall purpose of the plan is to provide a framework for a compact, orderly pattern of development within the Town's UGA and ensure adequate urban services to protect public health and welfare and enhance the quality of life within the community. The plan provides policies concerning where and how various land uses should be arranged to promote efficient and cohesive patterns of development, a complimentary blend of land use activities throughout the community. Our planning consultant Rod Orlando is here to highlight our response to the questions that the County has raised about the Town's capital facilities program.

ORLANDO: Rod Orlando, planning consultant for the Town of Yacolt. Rod Orlando, planning consultant for the Town. I wanted to respond to the two questions that were on the cover memo just in general first and then highlight some other interesting things about Yacolt's capital facilities program.

On the question of expanding public facilities and services sufficient to meet adopted LOS standards or level-of-service standards, the plan provides for the expansion of capital facilities to meet the adopted level-of-service standard for various urban services. The plan assumes that the community will experience only modest increase in population within the foreseeable future and that growth and development will be confined to the existing UGA, an area which corresponds

generally to the corporate limits. The second question is funding public facility improvements to meet demand within the UGA. The plan addresses meeting the demand for services within the existing urban area, or the town limits really, by expanding or improving facilities. Over the next six years Yacolt will rely primarily upon State and Federal grants to fund capital improvement projects for which it is responsible. And those are roads, stormwater control facilities and aspects of the Town's wastewater management program, but it will not depend upon outside sources of funding exclusively. Other public agencies are responsible for certain public services and facilities available to the community. Some of these agencies receive funding support from the Town. Others depend upon rate receipts and other sources of revenue to expand services and facilities, and you'll probably be hearing from those service providers today.

The long-term costs were estimated for only Yacolt's wastewater management program and this addresses a question that was raised concerning six years versus 20-year capital improvement program. The wastewater management costs through year 2022 were addressed in Yacolt's general sewer plan. These costs are roughly estimated and at slightly over \$5 million. The Town did not identify other capital projects that might be needed to accommodate growth and development beyond the six-year period since future growth within the community depends upon the advent of a public sewer system. The characteristics of the sewer system and the timing of its construction are not really known. It will take time to plan, design, permit and cobble together the funds to construct the sewer system and Yacolt cannot at this time honestly forecast when the system will be fully operation -- operational and determine the carrying capacity of that system. The Department of Ecology will require wastewater to be highly treated and significantly limit the amount of effluent that may be discharged from the treatment plant to the environment given the fragile ecology and important fish bearing streams in the area. The Ecology permitted capacity of the treatment plant will govern the amount of growth that the community will be able to absorb. Much will depend upon the technology available when the time comes to build the sewer system and whether the

Town will be able to afford it.

The best Yacolt can do at this juncture is assume that individual on-site systems will continue to be used to treat the community's wastewater. The large lots required for these on-site systems will significantly limit population growth. Given that assumption the Town projects its population to, to be between 1565 and some 1700 people by year 2023. That's about 450 to 600 new residents within the next 20 years. If the Town is successful in developing a public sewer system within say ten years, Yacolt's population could exceed this forecast. A sewer system would enable residential development at true urban densities, that's 5,000, 7,500-square foot minimum lot size for single family dwelling units, and it would also enable multiple family dwelling units to be constructed, and foster the establishment of new commercial and light industrial activities that may generate job opportunities providing an impetus for further growth. Given the advent of the sewer system Yacolt would need to make a mid course correction in its growth management plan and provide for higher densities than those identified in the current plan. It will reconfigure its lands use designations within community. It will identify a range of additional capital facility projects necessary to accommodate urban growth and may consider proposing an expansion of its urban growth boundary, but we're not there yet. That really concludes my remarks. I think the format's set up for questions, but that's what we wanted to say to the Board this morning.

MORRIS: Questions?

STANTON: I don't have any questions.

MORRIS: I don't either. Thank you. I know that in many regards -- in many ways you regard your septic issues as a difficulty, but to some of the other areas that are wringing their hands over how will they accommodate the growth that's coming their way, you might appear to have an easier time

of it so.

SMITH: We agree.

STANTON: Especially in terms of future costs for the community.

ORLANDO: The Town also in recognizing that it's going to be on septic systems for a while, and I think some of the Commissioners know this, part of its wastewater management program is to make sure that the septic systems work optimally so they've established a very rigorous locally mandated septic tank inspection maintenance program and they've installed ports on all the tank's risers so that the inspections can be performed efficiently and they're going to be inspecting these tanks from every other year, at least perhaps every year some of the systems, and Clark Public Utilities is involved in operating that program in conjunction with the Health Department and the Town of Yacolt, three agencies working together and making sure that those systems work until a public sewer system comes on board.

MORRIS: Thank you very much. Next is the City of La Center. We are working our way here from north to south.

IRISH: We only brought half the town.

MORRIS: I was going to say we have a large contingent and new faces.

IRISH: Commissioner Morris, Pridemore and Stanton, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you today about a topic that is very dear to my heart, the economic future and the vitality of the small city that I was elected to serve. I am Jim Irish, the Mayor of the City of La Center.

Simply put, our vision, our comprehensive plan, our capital facilities plan, are targeted like a laser on a few essential ingredients; enhancement of our small town atmosphere, economic diversity that includes our gaming industry, a thriving downtown and an eye on the employment prospects out La Center Road towards the I-5 Interchange. The East Fork of the Lewis River is our front door. We will do everything we can to make that river healthy for the benefit of the wildlife, the aquatic animal, the salmonoid fish and resident fish that depend upon the river while keeping it the focal point of the community pride and vitality; however, we are not afraid to cross the river in a search of the economic diversity and long-term sustainability that we like every other city in Clark County desire.

In 1994 my predecessor asked a different Board of Commissioners to put the La Center/I-5 Interchange within our urban growth boundary but fell short of that goal. Once again the La Center Junction is the economic prize that we seek, but this time our request is different. First, we ask that you enter into a joint venture with us to create a subarea plan for the long-term growth and management of the La Center Junction. Secondly, we ask that you expand our urban growth area to include the Timmen Road study area, a modest request that will help us create a future node of economic and employment activity. Over the past four years representatives of La Center have worked side-by-side with Clark County staff and elected officials, with our neighboring jurisdictions and with our citizens to create a vision and a plan for the future of our hometown. I want to thank you and your staff for the guidance, your patience and most importantly your willingness to listen to what is on the minds of those of us in the northern reaches of Clark County. I also wish to thank the many volunteers, staff members and advisors who helped us put some muscle and flesh on our vision of the future.

As you can see they told me I had to tie my hands together because I tend to get a little excited when I talk about the future of La Center, since like you, I want to do the very best for the people

who put their trust in me. Therefore, with me today are my technical experts, the Chairperson of the Planning Commission, Barbara Barnhart; our Public Works Director, Jeff Sarvis; two of our consultants of I know who you've seen before, Eric Eisemann of E2 Land Planning, E2 Use, yeah, anyway, you know who he is.

MORRIS: We know Eric.

IRISH: And Tyler Deke of Parsons Brinkerhoff. I'm going to ask them to provide the technical details to show you our work and to answer your questions as they arise. Before I turn over the microphone though, I want you to keep in mind the unofficial motto of our city: La Center, the little town that can. As you hear -- as you will hear we are a community that has met its obligations under the GMA. We have listened to our citizens. We have worked with the County through this long update process. We have developed a 20-year vision and comprehensive plan for our growth and development. We have expressed a willingness, a sincere willingness to partner with you to plan an employment base at Timmen's Road and at the La Center/I-5 Junction. And to clearly -- and clearly we have demonstrated La Center has a financial resource to finance the capital facilities needed to sustain our expected growth. Thank you for this time and for your serious consideration on our request. Barbara.

BARNHART: Okay. Thank you, Jim. Over the past four years of growth management planning the La Center Planning Commission has held 45 regular meetings; 4 special meetings; 12 work shops, several joint sessions with the City Council, a dozen public hearings, and has invited citizens to provide input on each of the elements of the Growth Management Act. One of the hottest topics during the process was the urban growth boundary expansion west toward I -- the I-5 Junction. Eagle Crest homeowners are present and vocal at our meetings. They stood firmly against the inclusion of the north side of La Center Road in the urban growth boundary process desiring to keep

their five-acre parcels from the new residential density. The Chamber of Commerce was interested in expansion to the Junction and several property owners on the northeast and southeast quadrants of the Junction are interested in development and continue to be so.

The Timmen's Road/La Center Road expansion effort had opposition testimony before the Board of County Commissioners and we did an analysis after reading their comments and discovered that more than two-thirds of them do not own property in that particular area, they were either adjacent, across the road and so on. We contacted the actual property owners and invited them to come to a special meeting and to join us in discussion of their vision for the property there. They attended our workshops, we met with them individually, we have a report of the study which we shared with you earlier and more than half of the Timmen's Road property owners now are interested in considering the -- their inclusion in the urban growth boundary. A few -- only one family is undecided and is definitely opposed and then there were several that are undecided. Commercial land within the city's boundary is limited. Most of the -- is composed of small parcels in the downtown area. Through a community and development building grant we developed a plan to revitalize our downtown and to expand the commercial possibilities. Public input has emphasized as Jim said that we want to keep that small town feeling and we have included that in our vision then, but we also believe that the Timmen's Road would be a wonderful gateway into the City of La Center. Beyond public comment at Planning Commission meetings we have sought input from questionnaires from city residents for specific areas and citizen and stakeholder interviews, Chamber of Commerce interaction, invitation to special interest groups as the owners of the big quadrants at the I-5 Junction and Eagle Crest and Timmen's and we feel that we have listened well to our citizens.

I just wanted to bring you up to date. On April 13th we had a Planning Commission meeting with the Timmen's property owners and I believe you have a report of their vision for the area, ideas and their dreams about what might happen with the property. We asked them to consider future

development and to let us know, and I believe this chart was in a packet that we gave to you and it shows in the gray those people are definitely interested in pursuing discussion on the development. The red is the one young family that is trying to buy the property from a grandparent. And the yellow is the kind of undecided. So we have more than half of the property owners interested in that. I wanted to read you a letter from the opposing young family, just the last paragraph of their letter.

MORRIS: Excuse me just a minute, Ms. Barnhart. I'm trying to -- we do not have copies of that apparently.

BARNHART: This was in a packet that we provided.

MORRIS: I don't see it in my packet here.

BARNHART: I can pass this on. Anyway, from the Doyle family they said "we would like to thank the Planning Commission for the positive atmosphere of the April 13th meeting. We were concerned in the past that opinions of the entire neighborhood were not being considered before a decision on urban growth boundary was to be made; however, it was clear at the past meeting that the Commission is seeking to represent the landowner's interest and desires."

And just my final comment, the 35 acres for mixed use that we are requesting be included in our expansion is but a minute request in comparison with the total number of acres apportioned to other cities in Clark County for industrial development. The City of La Center has no industrial land but we hope to in the future and we as we move toward our rightful position at I-5 Junction. We have Tyler next. Would you like to trade seats with me?

DEKE: Good morning. I'm just -- I'm here to respond to a couple of County staff questions regarding the transportation capital facilities plan. One of those questions is regarding adopted level-of-service standards and whether the submitted plan can meet prior adopted standards or whether lowered level-of-service standards are recommended. The prior comprehensive plan included a mix of level-of-service standards. The submitted plan includes a single unified level-of-service standard which does not -- which is not a lowered standard at the city's major intersections, it does mean a slightly lowered level-of-service at some of the city's peripheral intersections.

HOLLEY: I'm sorry, I don't know who you are.

DEKE: Oh, my name is Tyler Deke, D-e-k-e. The second question asked, do the submitted plans include projects beyond the short-term six-year horizon. The capital facilities -- transportation capital facilities plan includes three projects in the short range and about 13 projects in the 7 to 20-year range. The funding sources for those projects include a mix of City funds, traffic impact fees, grant funds, DOT funds and private, direct private contributions. And it should be noted that the adopted -- the recently adopted transportation plan includes four projects at the Timmen Road intersection assuming that that area will be annexed and become part of the community, and those projects in our analysis are shown as being needed regardless over the 20-year horizon whether that area is brought into the city or not, and by being added to the City's project list the cost of constructing those projects will fall to the City of La Center and to the adjacent property owners when those lands develop.

And lastly, the staff report included a specific question regarding external traffic impacts and the role of external traffic on project needs within the city of La Center and for projects near the city of La Center. In the packet you were provided this morning there's a detailed summary of external

traffic impacts and it should be noted that several of the facilities within the city of La Center and near the city of La Center has traffic impacts external to the city ranging in the -- ranging from over 30 percent to up to 70 percent. That's all.

STANTON: Oh, that was -- can I just ask a question right now?

MORRIS: Oh, of course.

STANTON: When you were listing sources of funds you didn't mention the County. And I might be thinking of Ridgefield or somewhere else, but I thought there was mention of a couple of projects that would most likely involve County involvement in your first proposal?

DEKE: Yeah, the staff report did mention County funding involvement. There are a series of projects identified at the Timmen Road intersection, at the I-5 Interchange, and then a couple of projects that are right on the periphery of the community. The two projects on the periphery of the community would be not be needed until those -- until those areas are developed and our assumption is is that the funding for those improvements would come directly from the City and through traffic impact fees. And the projects at I-5 Interchange and at Timmen Road, the Timmen Road projects at this point we're assuming will be jointly funded by private TIF dollars and City dollars and the I-5 projects would likely include City funding, DOT funding and County funding.

STANTON: I don't think we have that in our capital facilities planning, it's not a project that's listed I don't believe. I don't think I saw it. The one you just mentioned with the County funding. So there might be a disconnect there.

DEKE: Right. I believe there is.

MORRIS: But that's not immediate?

DEKE: No. Well, there are -- we're showing --

MORRIS: I mean that -- certainly that would not be anybody's responsibility unless that was a part of an urban growth boundary --

DEKE: The --

MORRIS: -- certainly not La Center's.

DEKE: No.

MORRIS: When you'd begin to talk about the I-5 Interchange you bring in a whole host of issues that are not particularly connected to what you are asking for here which is just the expansion of the 35 acres along the Timmen's Road area. That as I understand when you spoke to me is actually a plus for the County because the need for some of those improvements at the intersection of La Center Road and Timmen's Road would currently fall to the County, but would not if they came into the UGB?

DEKE: Correct.

MORRIS: Although technically they would still be ours until you annexed?

DEKE: Correct.

MORRIS: But we would be delighted to have you offer to pay for them all just by yourselves.

DEKE: The adopted plan does assume a large City contribution to those projects --

MORRIS: Okay. Thank you.

DEKE: -- and no County contribution at the Timmen Road intersection.

MORRIS: Yeah. Right. Thank you.

SARVIS: Good morning. I'm Jeff Sarvis, Public Works Director, City of La Center. We'll talk about Timmen Road in about two minutes. I'm going to start my discussion by reminding you that the public -- Public Works in La Center is a little bit different, we don't do water and sewer, Clark Public Utilities owns and operates the water and sewer systems in the city of La Center. But the bottom line is that water and sewer services can be made available to all areas within the UGA, including the Timmen Road area. We did look at that. Primarily financing of water and sewer systems is expected to be developer driven. Recent expansion of the wastewater treatment facility will accommodate growth beyond this planning period, it is now on-line. A new 500,000 gallon reservoir is being placed on-line as we speak. During the last year the City of La Center has completed capital facilities plans for transportation, parks, police and stormwater. The Public Works Department have beefed up staff, beefed up our small works roster along with interlocal agreements for road maintenance services. Fire District 12 and the La Center School District have prepared their own capital facilities plans which are adopted by the City. As you can see capital facilities are in place or planned for all of the La Center UGA expansion areas including

Timmen's Road.

The City of La Center recently, and I'm going to follow up a little bit with what Tyler did, he's a consultant for the City, the City of La Center recently performed a transportation analysis of the Timmen Road area. Outcome of the analysis is that the Timmen Road intersection will fail within the next six to seven years regardless of UGA expansion. The City of La Center adopted as part of the La Center transportation capital facilities plan \$900,000 worth of improvements to the Timmen Road intersection. Consistently the City maintains a policy of level-of-service C for all roads and intersections within our urban growth area. The City of La Center currently encumbers all capital facility projects in our reserve fund. This means that the Timmen Road improvements if within La Center's UGA will occur as service levels dictate. As Public Works Director for the City of La Center I find myself in a unique position that all capital facilities can be funded with cash. That's not to say they would be, but they can be. In particular services that affect the traveling public. I'm also pleased that La Center is proactive not only in the areas of public infrastructure but recreation, critical areas and shoreline protection. Thank you for your time and I'd invite you to visit La Center, enjoy our amenities, and I'd be happy to answer any questions once the presentation is done. Thank you.

MORRIS: Thank you.

EISEMANN: And last, Eric Eisemann, E-i-s-e-m-a-n-n, E2 Land Use Services, 317 Columbia, Vancouver 98660. It's good to see all of you again. It's a pleasure to be in front of you hopefully one last time as we close down the GMA update process for this decade. I have about two minutes to close this thing down. As you've heard, La Center is in an enviable position regarding capital facilities planning. It can and it will fund the necessary improvements that the City requires to have a modest growth expansion occur in that community. So we don't need to talk a lot more about the

capital facilities issues, it can be taken care of and as Jeff said with cash. What I'd like to remind you of, though, is what the City's vision is and how we got to this place right.

Now the City's 2023 planning vision is for a small town on the bank of the East Fork of the Lewis River with a diversified economic base, not just a one industry town. We're planning for about 3500 to 4,000 people within the growth boundary and within the modest expansion for residential lands of about 65 gross acres. The City has amended its comprehensive plan to include a target goal of four units per net acre which is consistent with County policy and the 1992 community framework plan. It has amended its development regulations to include a plan unit development ordinance and a manufactured home regulations, and it allows multi-family housing in its one residential zone. So it is charged and ready to meet its affordable housing goals and the goal of no more than 75 percent of a single housing product. It is willing as the Mayor has said and others have said, and a request again to enter in a cooperative partnership with the County regarding the Timmen or the intersection of La Center Road and I-5 and it will participate financially in that process and it would like to get it started now.

The City has adopted best available science based on critical areas ordinance. It's ahead of the curve in terms of its environmental protection. There are no environmental issues in the city of La Center that cannot be met by compliance with its code and with State statute. As you heard, the City is involved in a downtown planning project, we're entering Phase 2 this summer. The goal is to create a vibrant mix of uses downtown that looks to the river and looks to bringing in housing and office space downtown so. Consistent with GMA, La Center has looked inward as well as looked outward. Looking outward you've heard us talk about Timmen's Road repeatedly. The goal there is a healthy mix of retail, office and multi-family housing. The City Council is unanimous in its goal to create an economic base for the community and the Timmen Road step towards the I-5 Junction is a logical step-by-step incremental growth across the river and it's completely consistent

with GMA principles of developing economic stability and incremental growth.

Finally I would just like to leave this message with you, as the City that can, La Center has done everything that's required under the Growth Management Act. It has set realistic goals for a town of its size, it has the ability and will fully fund its capital facility services and it has shown you its work. It has given you the base that you need to make a decision to expand the growth boundary based upon solid planning principles and capital facilities. Thank you and we're happy to answer any questions you might have, all five of us.

MORRIS: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

EISEMANN: Thank you. All right.

MORRIS: And next we have the City of Ridgefield.

DORIOT: Good morning, Commissioner Morris, Pridemore and Stanton. On behalf of the Ridgefield City Council, Ridgefield Planning Commission and the Ridgefield community thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning. For the last four years the City of Ridgefield has worked in partnership with Clark County and other cities in the current comprehensive plan update effort. We are supportive of the current UGA expansion proposal for the City. We have invested significant resources in planning for the City's future growth and will continue to strategically invest resources in the future. Recently the City has made several investments in staffing resources to help the City meet current and future level-of-service obligations, implement existing and new programs and provide high quality customer service for the Ridgefield community. I am happy to introduce George Fox, the interim City Manager, to speak to you briefly about the status of the City and to introduce key staff people. Thank you.

FOX: Hello, Commissioners, I'm George Fox, I'm the interim City Manager for the City of Ridgefield. Briefly since I haven't met you, I'm a CPA and an attorney, I've been doing this for about 20 years, the last eight years for various local government's in the city -- in the state of Washington. The City hired me four months ago and so I inherited a lot of what we're about to talk to you about. And they had some goals for me when they hired me. First, was to review and improve the program management of the City and to look at our service delivery options and make sure that we were doing the best we could. The second was to implement policies and procedures consistent with the direction of the City Council. And the third was to establish a new management team for the City and some of the results of that management team are sitting here today.

We have some new folks for me to introduce to you, and I would like to start with introducing Kevin Snyder, our Planning Director. We have at the end over here Justin Clary, our Public Works Director. You know Eric Eisemann from E2 Land Use Planning Services, he's our consulting planner. And coming up here shortly will be David Jansen, our new City Engineer, and Chuck Green from Parsons Brinkerhoff, the traffic consultant to the City. And I'd like to --

MORRIS: Excuse me. I feel like after all these introductions I have to say and we are.

PRIDEMORE: Craig Pridemore, Clark County.

FOX: How do you do.

MORRIS: Betty Sue Morris.

STANTON: Judie Stanton. I'm really pleased to meet you finally. I've read a lot about you and

what you're doing in Ridgefield and it's just good to meet you face-to-face.

FOX: Thank you very much, a pleasure to meet you all too. I'm going to let Mr. Snyder take over the presentation here, he's our expert on what has happened, and I'm going to let the other experts fill in any questions you might have. And again a pleasure to have met you all.

SNYDER: Good morning, Commissioners Morris, Pridemore and Stanton. For the record my name is Kevin Snyder, I'm the City's new planning director, been on the job a little over four weeks, and I'm happy to be here and be before you today. I wanted to take time this morning to really just follow up on the work that has been done over the last four years. Your staff has done an excellent job in the supplemental report that they submitted to you and has given you a lot of information.

The goal today is just to add to that information base for your decision making over the next few weeks. You received from the Mayor and the interim City Manager a letter dated July 9th that was transmitted to you and in that letter we tried to again supplement to your information base, so my goal today is to briefly review the contents of that letter and to give you a level of understanding of the various activities that staff has engaged in in order to again meet the City's level-of-service obligations both now and in the future.

As you are aware, the City of Ridgefield is currently planning for a 2023 population of approximately 11,300 to 12,000 persons. We're also planning for an employment base of approximately 5,712 jobs. Our capital facilities planning efforts have been based on these figures and these assumptions and have guided us as well as working with members of the County staff in terms of how we plan adequately for capital facilities. One of the issues that the City faces in terms of its capital facilities is obviously sewer. The staff has given you a lot of information in the staff report and I want to add to that. Right now we have current capacity in our sewer system to

accommodate residential and nonresidential growth over the next three calendar years. We anticipate under our current system development charge fee structure of approximately \$4 million in system development charges to help offset some of our capital improvement costs. We are currently analyzing a possible adjustment for consideration by our City Council to this fee that if was passed by City Council could equate to \$5.7 million in system development charges. Again we're trying to be proactive in looking at the capital improvement needs and making sure that there is adequate public funding for those. We are targeting right now July 2006 as the completion of our next phase of upgrades to our wastewater treatment plant and our City Engineer is working with his staff to make sure that we are adequately planning for that and are putting in place the various programs that we need to do to make that happen.

We submitted a draft sewer capital facility plan to the Clark County in the winter of 2003. We are currently updating that plan based on the additional UGA expansion that has previously been presented to you and we anticipate having that to Clark County for review and concurrence by September of 2004. We are currently contract -- we have contracted with Gray & Osborn who is providing the City consulting services in the area of engineering to complete the City's sewer and general facilities plan, we anticipate that that will be completed by May 2005. And the intent of that plan is to provide options or identify options for medium wastewater conveyance needs, treatment and effluent requirements for the entire UGA, including the proposed additional expanded areas. We have also accepted a loan offer from the Public Works trust fund to begin to design the City's T-7 interceptor line to bypass the downtown's collection system. This was an issue that was raised in the staff report by your staff as a concern about the adequacy of the capacity in our downtown collection system, we are planning on a way to address that by building a bypass system. We anticipate that that design effort will be completed in March 2005 and we are currently awaiting a construction loan decision from the Public Works trust fund to actually construct that T-7 line. We hope to hear in October of 2004. If we are awarded we would anticipate construction beginning

in April of 2005 and hopefully be complete with construction and operational by June 2006.

In the areas of transportation, the City has a -- previously adopted a transportation capital facilities plan in the winter of 2003. We again based on the additional UGA expansion are completing an update of that transportation capital facilities plan. We are again targeting September of 2004 to have that for submittal to Clark County for review and concurrence. As part of that effort we are going back and reviewing our TIF program and identifying the appropriate public/private cost share elements. In the letter that was submitted to you you have a draft table that shows the public/private share of cost breakdown both in terms of percentages and dollars as well as what we anticipate as a possible average daily trip fee of approximately \$187. That should be at the back of the letter that you received.

STANTON: That really little bitty bitty print?

SNYDER: Really, I apologize. It was on a huge scale and we tried to get it down, yes, you need a microscope almost to see it, I do apologize for that, but hopefully if you peer hard enough you can see that we are looking to again provide -- strike a balance between public and private monies, and the City goal is in the public cost component to make sure that we are working to improve connectivity and mobility in the city to the greatest extent possible to provide maximum movement of vehicles, pedestrian, freight and other forms of transportation. We approved a six-year transportation improvement program on June 24th, 2004. Our City Council adopted the ordinance. That guides staff in the implementation and prioritization of traffic and transportation improvement needs. We have entered into an agreement with the Washington State Department of Transportation to collect pro rata share monies from development around the Ridgefield interchange with I-5 to develop short-term programmed improvements at that interchange. We anticipate that that construction will begin in March 2005 and that includes various road improvements as well as some

signalization. We are working with the Port of Ridgefield on the evaluation of long-term improvements to Pioneer Street corridor and the I-5 Interchange. That is a partnership that obviously the two parties have a vested interest in so we are working in partnership with them on a long-term planning analysis. Finally, the Union Ridge development, we are anticipating they will begin construction of a new east/west road connecting the Pioneer Street interchange to NE 10th Avenue which will provide a major east/west connector in the Ridgefield Junction area for the City.

In the area of water capital facilities, we submitted a draft capital facilities plan to Clark County in the winter of 2003. Again consistent with the sewer and transportation capital facilities plan we are in the process of updating that based on the additional UGA expansion and we are anticipating having that to you by September of 2004. We are also contracting -- we have contracted with Gray & Osborn, our City engineering consultant, to update the City's water system plan which would anticipate would be complete by May 2005 and that will help us prioritize our capital improvements and help us assess water sources within the community, including possible interties with Clark Public Utilities.

In the area of stormwater we're not expecting any changes to the 1995 stormwater capital facilities element of the comprehensive plan. As your staff noted in their staff report that is something that the City is relatively satisfied with; however, we are currently evaluating a possible development of a comprehensive stormwater management plan for the City that could possibly include the development of a stormwater system development charge and a stormwater utility to offset and prioritize public improvements in the area of stormwater. Finally, we are working right now on the development of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Washington Department of Ecology on a new program that they have called the Landscape Analysis Approach which tries to implement a holistic approach to stormwater and management and sensitive lands protection. We -- if our City Council is supportive of that effort we would begin the Phase 1 work on that and have it hopefully

done by this fall, and then that would be a jumping off point for the City to decide if they want to go further down this road. And again, it's a moving away from site-by-site stormwater treatment to a more regional approach within the city limits, so we're excited about that.

In summary, the City feels confident that the work that has been done over the last four years provides adequate information to the County and to the County Commissioners relative to the capital facilities planning, the level-of-service obligations that the City will need to meet and that we have prioritized our funding sources. With that we have a whole host of staff here that are available to answer any questions that you might have and we thank you for the opportunity to appear before you.

STANTON: I have two questions. One is on your chart where you talk about the transportation capital facilities refers to WDOT funding clearly and TIF funding and grant funding and then it says public share percent. Can I read "public share" to mean the City of Ridgefield or are there some assumed County funds in there as well?

GREEN: I'll lean over. Chuck Green with Parsons Brinkerhoff, 400 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 802, Portland 97204. We do not anticipate a huge amount of County funds as part of that public share. We believe that there might be some County benefit to improvements at the Pioneer/Ridgefield/I-5 Interchange that serve the 259th Daybreak area and thus would have some benefit to current rural trips, but that is percentage points of what we would seek as a County share of funding. It is not anywhere near a large amount, it's -- and when I talk "percentages" I'm talking less than five.

STANTON: I just ask similar to the way I asked La Center because if indeed we're talking about County funding, somewhere it needs to get into the prioritization array of the County, and in both instances I don't believe that those projects are itemized in the County's 20-year transportation plan.

My other question has to do with in the staff report, I guess the best way to describe it, it's in the sewer section, Page 28, where there's a statement that staff in their summary talks about Area 4 on the west side of NW 31st Avenue, and their comment is that that area should be reconsidered because it would require the extension of a planned but unfunded trunk sewer, an additional 3500 feet to the southeast through rural properties and due to the terrain isn't a very appropriate place to be expanding. Do you have any comment about that statement?

EISEMANN: Eric Eisemann. Eisemann, E-i-s-e-m-a-n-n. The provision of sewer services for that Area 4 would be consistent with the City's approach to providing sewer service for the new school area off of South Hillhurst Road. It's developer financed and funded 100 percent.

MORRIS: I have a couple of questions as well, but did you want to speak first? Are you through?

SNYDER: Yes, thank you.

MORRIS: Okay. I had that same thing marked, so thank you for asking that question. I wanted to refer again to your payment for your transportation projects, and you have in addition to the ones Commissioner Stanton called out, you have a private share percent which I'm assuming is clearly in addition to the traffic impact fees and are what might be considered that's what you have to build if you want to get it, and at the total on your far two right columns you have again a private share at 12.12 and a, I'm sorry, that would be the TIF, and then in addition to that a 37.15 percent private share which I add to somewhere a little past 49 percent. So you are actually contemplating 49 percent of these costs to be absorbed by the private sector; is that right?

GREEN: Again for the record Chuck Green. Yes, we are. And you're right on that the private share is essentially in compliance with the City street standards for the most part, there are other

parts where the developer would build the entire street and it's not subject to traffic impact fees to begin with therefore it's not part of that system. The 49 percent is indeed the private share. The 51 percent public share includes a variety of WSDOT and grant assumptions, the primary one of which on the WSDOT side is we believe that the next round of the nickel package works its way up I-5 and would encompass the Ridgefield interchange when and if that occurs in the near future.

The grant share, our assumptions there is that in the near future as well the City of Ridgefield will exceed the 5,000 resident threshold and as such it puts them in a new category for State Transportation Improvement Board Funding which is actually a much larger pot to draw from and we've anticipated a reasonable success level for that funding program. On the other, the remainder of the public share would require the City to enact a street fund, that was a consideration and part of their winter 2003 adoption. We have two members of the City Council here as far as their opinions on moving forward with the city street fund, but that is indeed a part of this, the implementation of the capital facilities plan will be a dedicated street fund.

MORRIS: Well, I actually, I guess, I wanted to thank you for clarifying the private sector here and calling it out. We actually have a study which showed that 60 percent of ours, arterials and our major collectors are private funded and I have repeatedly asked staff if they wouldn't include the private share in our calculations about how we finance, but so far I have been unsuccessful in getting that done. But I do thank you for including it here because it is again demonstrative of the way we are relying more and more on the private sector to build our infrastructure for us so. Thank you. Appreciate it. Other questions?

STANTON: Thank you.

MORRIS: Okay. The City of Washougal.

ANDERSON: Good morning, Chair Morris and Commissioner Stanton and Pridemore. My name is Monty Anderson and I'm the Planning and Development Director from the City of Washougal and I'm here today to address the issues of capital facilities planning for the City as it relates to the overall countywide planning policies. And the result is that in February 3rd of this, of 2003, our land use plan and comprehensive plan were adopted -- was adopted by our City Council. On the heels of that we enlisted the services of consulting engineers to help us with looking at our water and sewer plans and our transportation plans and we did the internal review for parks and fire and police. The result is that our comprehensive plan projected 7,806 new residents to our city by 2023. There were no boundary expansions contemplated to accommodate that population with the exception of a 20-acre parcel which the city of, or excuse me, the Camas School District has requested be included in our urban growth boundary at Crown Road and roughly 34th Street. So the result is we are -- we have not promoted -- have no boundary expansions promoted for our city with the exception of the Camas School District. The result was that the land use plan would accommodate our population as projected and as a result our adopted capital facilities plans show that those residents can be accommodated as well.

For water we do need an extra well, another well I should say, and that is part of our capital facilities plan. And there's been a search essentially done as we speak and a preferred site in one of the parks identified. It does not mean that it is an operational well now, but it is one that can be and that would help accommodate the population projected. Similarly for sewers, we essentially have some projected distribution projects but also need an additional clarifier by 2023 to accommodate that population which is a 9,950,000 item that essentially would accommodate both the clarifier and the distribution, so the result is that is a projected project that we need to accommodate. In order to help pay for that there's an SDC charge contemplated of about \$3,500 for each unit. In essence we look at stormwater, as you know we operate on the basis of on-site stormwater management. We

have asked for a request for qualifications in May of this year to actually prepare a stormwater plan which would accommodate a district as well as some generated revenue fees to help offset essentially the maintenance of existing facilities as well as new ones, as new ones.

We have two school districts in our city, one is Camas and one is Washougal. We've mentioned Camas already and that is the major impact on our growth management planning efforts is that 20-acre parcel I talked to you about just a minute ago. The second one is that for the Washougal District which covers most of the corporate city limits of Washougal essentially has identified the need for three new schools within the school district itself. There are two sites that have been -- or one site that has been identified for two schools at the corner of Sunset View Road and Evergreen Way which would accommodate not only the new school facilities administration building and commissary, but also some sports fields and two schools so that 30-acre parcel was available for that particular kind of construction and some of it is underway as we speak.

With regard to parks, we are -- we have an inventory of parks that certainly meets our standard of five units to the acre or five acres to a thousand population. Where we are weak in the parks department is that we do not have the developed parks that we need to have to accommodate the population. Our first step essentially is to have a stand-alone parks plan that can be utilized with IAC grant funding requests which we do not have and is scheduled for this coming year. We do have 27 acres of developed parks, as we speak we need 48.88 acres, so we do not have a complete contingency of acreage that's developed for parks purposes.

For police services we have a police station which was constructed with bond monies approved by the citizens of Washougal and that building was constructed in 2003 and dedicated in 2004. That is to basically accommodate our space needs for capital facilities for our police officers. And on the operational side there is a desire to have 1.8 officers per thousand population which basically means

by 2023 we would need 30 officers. For fire we had a capital facilities plan which was approved of, then amended and then ultimately updated which has been before you and the result has been that we've initiated a fire impact fee to help offset those needs for fire services and that is in place.

There is an identified need for another fire station on the west side of town to accommodate the five minute response time which is the level-of-service that we are directed to. Taken together there is a second fire station that's been identified as well and this has all been done through a committee of citizens who have been identifying essentially fire needs, if you will, for our community. The result is there's a \$2 million ticket that would go along for both of those facilities. As a side note, there was some talk about having a police precinct within one of them as they are built. In essence on the operational side, the fire facility services needs are .89 officers or firemen per thousand population that's been identified, which means that by 2023 there would be a need for approximately 16 officers that are paid firemen that would be on 24/7.

Finally I want to talk a little bit about our transportation level-of-service questions. The result is that we operate on a basis of level-of-service D except for signalized intersections which is E. We had an identified list of projects that were noted as being failing intersections by 2023 in the reports that were submitted to you and those basically do not have essentially cost attached to them, which is a weakness in that report, not because of the work that was done but because of the direction that was not given. The result is that as we speak now we have one failing intersection within our community and that is at 32nd and SR-14 and that is to be corrected in 2005 through the efforts of WSDOT as well as the City of Washougal and to some degree essentially with the County as well, but the result is that we asked our consulting firm to look at the summary that was done by the County staff and asked for their opinion about its review of the work that was done, the result is, and Oliver I think has a copy of this letter, is that it concluded that the report that was done by the County is accurate and there are some things that essentially the City needs to accomplish and that relates to the cost for these improvements at these failing intersections, essentially a financial plan,

if you will, and then also some policy statements about collaboration and coordination and those kinds of things and this is an update that's supposed to occur in our 2005 cycle as well.

Two pieces that aren't in the plan and never were in the plan in 1994 was essentially a bicycle and pedestrian plan and that we're willfully need of having that done as well too, you know. So these things that I'm expressing to you, Chair Morris and Commissioners, are things that we need to address and I don't want to hide them under the carpet because the result is transportation is critically important to us all and we are very weak in those areas.

In essence I think the summary is this: For water and sewer we are on task and on target for providing those services for the projected population to 2023. We definitely need to have a stormwater plan and a way to pay for it, which would be a district. We did have an RFQ that went out and have responses to it to prepare that plan. Schools we talked about, Washougal needs, the school district needs three within the next to 2023 and there are two sites that have already been sited for them, Camas has one sited at Crown Road which we've talked about. The police, we have a new fire -- or new station for their needs, it's not projected that there is any further need till 2023 for those capital facilities for police. For fire we've acquired a new fire engine and another squad truck and have improved essentially the fire station with remodeling because of some storm damage that occurred during the winter as well as just some long-term poor maintenance of that building which will bring it back on-line. There is identified need for two stations, one on the east side and one on the west side in the future. For parks, we talked about essentially we need 48.8 acres of improved parks, we currently have 27, we have an inventory of approximately 127 acres for park purposes. So with that, Chair Morris and Commissioner Stanton and Pridemore, I just want to conclude that we need to do work on our transportation efforts, apologize to you and your staff for that, and then secondly dealing with the stormwater and the rest of the items we've talked about essentially are fairly well in tow and are on target.

MORRIS: I had a couple of questions for you. You have an inventory of 129 acres of park land; is that what you said?

ANDERSON: That's correct.

MORRIS: You have 27 that are developed and you should have in your plan 48 --

ANDERSON: Should have --

MORRIS: -- but you have the acreage, you just don't -- am I right?

ANDERSON: You're right. We have -- right now we have a need for 48 acres of improved park land, right now we have only 27 of them improved. We have an inventory of approximately 127.

MORRIS: So you have enough acres?

ANDERSON: Yes.

MORRIS: It's just the same question about parks we all face?

ANDERSON: Correct.

MORRIS: Okay. And second, on your planning issue for your failing intersections is it just a question of your planning cycle being different than ours or is it just something that you haven't gotten around to or --

ANDERSON: Well, it's just been an internal problem that we haven't been able to address these as strongly as we might.

MORRIS: We understand that.

STANTON: I'm glad you mentioned Highway 14 and the intersection at 32nd because under the State's summary comments that we have here I was surprised to read that SR-14 will have no failures. Is that what you intended to say on the summary of transportation issues for the State DOT? Because I thought 32nd was one and certainly right now 162nd is in failure, 164th.

ANDERSON: It could be a discrepancy too, Commissioner Stanton, is that it's one leg of that intersection that failed, it's not the whole intersection.

STANTON: Okay. So in --

ANDERSON: So I don't know if that makes a difference or not, but it's still failing.

STANTON: And that's going to be addressed in the next year or so?

ANDERSON: 2005.

STANTON: It's on Page 65, Pat, if you're looking through the summary.

LEE: Yes, I am. Thank you.

ANDERSON: The only other intersection is B at 32nd which is the same street that intersects with SR-14 and that's a signal problem and that's coming very close to failing.

STANTON: That can be a question that you can get back to us on, Pat, it's just a question of the work that needs to be done on Highway 14. I know it's been labeled as a highway of statewide significance which makes it a little more immune to identifying failures unfortunately. Thank you.

MORRIS: Doesn't it also make it eligible for special kinds of State funding as well?

STANTON: I don't think so. I think they don't get to count it, you don't have to count the problems.

MORRIS: Questions? Thank you.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

STANTON: Thanks, Monty.

MORRIS: And we have one more city, the City of Camas.

SNELL: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record Marty Snell, the City of Camas. I'm going to keep my comments actually a little brief and in an effort to get out of here a little earlier. I'd like to speak to you regarding our capital facilities plan and the urban growth boundary in looking at this map here that you have. Essentially --

MORRIS: We don't have a map with us.

SNELL: Oh, you don't have a map with you, I'm sorry. Essentially there are three areas on the west side of Camas between Camas and Vancouver, the southerly, there's the Winchester Hills and Grand Ridge area, there's only a bit of vacant land available. The capital facilities actually are in place in those areas that serve those subdivisions, Winchester Hills and Grand Ridge. The middle area of that western boundary is the Bybee Road area. Most of that is planned for employment uses. There's a bit of residential, current existing residential that is on a combination of private wells, public water and individual septic systems. We have capital facilities in place in Pacific Rim Drive and 38th that would serve those areas. We are looking at water reservoir capacity to serve the west side in the city limits now and also to serve those urban growth boundary expansion areas. The area known as the Strunk property which is at SE 1st and formerly 202nd Avenue is an area that has all the capital facilities serving that area. In fact both the City of Vancouver, Clark County, along with the City of Camas is in underway with the SE 1st/Lake Road improvement that will widen that street to a five lane arterial.

The other area is area east of the Lacamas Heights area. We are actually entertaining an annexation petition at the moment to look at that property becoming part of the city of Camas. The real significant need for capital facility there is a water reservoir. We have an existing 100,000 gallon stand pipe known as the Gregg Reservoir, we'd be looking at perhaps a two million gallon water reservoir to serve that area and the backbone of perhaps 10 or 20-year window on the north side of Lacamas Lake. Most of these areas we have plans to serve with either neighborhood parks on the west side in the Bybee Road area, a neighborhood park in the Lacamas Heights area. We'll also have transportation facilities planned at 20th Street to extend that across the Fisher Swale into the existing 20th Street Vancouver. I do have a letter from the Mayor that I'd like to submit to you that speaks to the request to again include the Green Mountain Resort property and I'll kind of touch on the bullet points in the letter and then leave it open for any questions that you might have so.

This letter is dated July 13th, it's from the Mayor Dennis. Again without reading the entire letter I'll get to the bullet points here and the Green Mountain request. One is that the areas within the City of Camas water service and EMS service boundaries we serve, that Green Mountain is currently served by an upsized water main that represents a long-term capital facility investment by the City of Camas and received approval from the County's Boundary Review Board in 1999. State GMA, as well as several legal cases, suggest cities and counties consider areas within existing urban services before expanding into rural areas. Green Mountain site has conducted a thorough Environmental Impact Statement which received final approval circa in 1996. And lastly the Green Mountain area represents the last remaining area that would designate the east/west jurisdictional boundary between the Camas and Vancouver from the Columbia River north. One other comment to this letter is that this was actually I shared with the City of Vancouver and of course there's been a good deal of negotiation between what comes to Vancouver and what comes to the City of Camas, a good deal of discussion about what happens to the Strunk Dairy is a part of why we request the Green Mountain to be included. We've actually garnered some support from the City of Vancouver, Mayor Pollard, to include Green Mountain in the City of Camas urban growth boundary. So with that I would entertain any questions that you might have. And lastly commend your staff and yourselves for all the hard work that's been underway for four or five years to get to this point.

MORRIS: What was the -- what was the last discussion we had about Green Mountain? I don't recall a very receptive Board to that request. Am I remembering that --

LEE: No. No, it was directly discussed when you were looking at the January 14th map and it was determined at this time that you didn't feel it was appropriate to bring that into the boundary.

MORRIS: Do you remember why?

LEE: I think there is a couple of reasons. One is that we believed we were already at the capacities necessary to accommodate the growth. Two, was a little further out than some of the other areas that we looked at. And, three, there is a fairly wet environmentally constrained area that intervenes between the current urban growth boundary and the Green Mountain area. I think those were the three key issues that sort of led to the conclusion that maybe it was not best to bring it in at this time.

MORRIS: What was your proposed zoning for that?

SNELL: It was going to be a mixed, mixed use. There are some employment opportunities out there immediately surrounding the golf course with plans for commercial, retail, perhaps convention type, a meeting space, and then there's some residential that would be a mix of residential be it attached and detached.

One other comment I forgot to mention is that there is a reference in that letter to a map and I was unable to confirm and verify this morning with the Mayor the map that he's talking about, but in our comp plan the first figure under our Appendix Figure 1 is now our proposed urban growth boundary expansion area which includes the Green Mountain. So I think that's pretty close to the mark, but I will verify and E-mail something to your staff before the end of the day or end of tomorrow.

MORRIS: Could you just get the map with it too, the map with it?

SNELL: Yes.

MORRIS: Other questions?

SNELL: Thank you so much.

MORRIS: That concludes our agenda of cities for this morning. We'll be back here at 1:15 again to reconvene with discussions from Battle Ground, Vancouver, Hazel Dell Sewer District, Salmon Creek Treatment Plant, CPU, the schools and the Sheriff, and from 3:15 until 4:00 we'll take testimony from anyone else who would like to make remarks.

LEE: I would also note that WSU has requested to present remarks and they were allotted the 2:45 time slot.

MORRIS: Thank you. 2:45?

LEE: Yeah.

MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. And then Commissioner Stanton has just pointed out to me that we actually reconvene here at 1:00. So we'll see you back here at 1:00. Thank you.

(Pause in proceedings from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

MORRIS: We'll reconvene this afternoon with our public hearing on capital facilities plans for our cities and for our other service providers. This morning we heard from the Town of Yacolt and the Cities of La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal and Camas. This afternoon we'll begin with Battle Ground followed by the City of Vancouver, Hazel Dell Sewer District and the Salmon Creek Treatment Plant, CPU, Clark Public Utilities, the schools. And we had a change in this agenda I believe, we are putting WSU, is that correct, at what time, Mr. Lee?

LEE: WSU I have after schools. We have the Sheriff at 2:30 to 2:45 and then from 2:45 to 3:00 WSU.

MORRIS: And then WSU. All right. Thank you. At 3:15, then, we will take comment from other speakers. So do we have someone from Battle Ground here to start the afternoon? Please join us.

OSBORN: I wanted to thank the Commissioners for having us here this afternoon and with me, first of all Dennis Osborn, Deputy City Manager with the City of Battle Ground; Sam Adams, City's Public Works director, and Brian Carrico, the Community Development Director, and Rob Charles behind him, he is the Assistant City Public Works Director. With that I guess I'll just turn it right over to Sam and let him walk through what our facility plans are showing to date. I think the Commissioners are aware that we are still awaiting from our consultants our transportation plan. We met with them yesterday morning, we are still anticipating having that completed by August 25th. We are trying to push that up and they're aware of that and doing their best that they can, but work is still moving forward on the transportation component. And with that I'll turn it over to Sam.

ADAMS: Sure. Thank you. What I'm going to do is just walk through the costs that we have in our plans and anticipated impact fee increases that we're seeing right now. Starting off with parks facilities, we have up there on the board our six-year capital plan for parks is roughly 14 million. Our 20 year is \$25 million. That includes existing -- improvements to the existing parks is probably the largest number there at 21 million. Then we're talking about doing 13 additional neighborhood parks at a cost of 4.4 million. Right now we're estimating that impact fee, parks impact fee, at approximately \$1200.

Next on the list is our sewer capital facilities plan, the six-year improvement plan is 17.5 million. The 20-year plan is -- or 20-year capital improvement plan is 28 million. One thing that I would like to add, our plan talks about the Salmon Creek Phase 4 but the costs are not included in there so I just wanted to make you aware of that, Hazel Dell will be talking about that here shortly. The estimated system development charge for our sewer, our existing now is \$2,068, that will go up to \$3500. Any questions on those two before I move, move on?

MORRIS: On the sewer --

ADAMS: Yeah.

MORRIS: -- does that include repair cost to the sewer lines that you have already?

ADAMS: No.

MORRIS: You've been working through that systematically, but that does not include repair to existing sewer lines?

ADAMS: Right. It does not include an I&I program or (inaudible).

MORRIS: And given the location of the expansion of your boundaries, how much of your sewage would need to move through those older pipes? Some would and some would not I'm assuming.

ADAMS: It depends on the area you're in. We put up a pretty good backbone system, we call it the West Side Transmission System, and that has the capacity to handle growth heading west and north, say north of Main Street, pretty much can handle that. And actually that west main interceptor also

picks up a lot of our new area to the north and the east. Believe it or not we're actually going to get it all the way over and get it into that interceptor line, so we're in pretty good shape there. There is some pump stations that need to be upgraded as they see more flow, but for the most part we're in pretty good shape with our current system taking additional flow.

STANTON: But the upgrades will require some additional capital and you have a financing plan in mind?

ADAMS: Yeah. When you're looking -- when you're looking at those typically in the pump stations, like I say the backbone system is pretty good so we really don't have a lot of upgrades we need to do to the existing systems. We would fall back on either rates and/or we could use SDC's if we needed to oversize a line for development so.

OSBORN: If I could add something too. At this time we've met with Council and talked about these figures with Council for a way to pay for these plans. No final decision has been made yet of course because Council hasn't forwarded on a formal recommendation to the Commissioners, but the Council was fine to present to the Board of Commissioners that this would be how we would pay for our facility plans by these increases in the system development charges. Existing systems within the City where it's not growth related impacts but just ongoing maintenance and operation type facilities I anticipate, and, Sam, correct me if I'm wrong, that they'll probably look at what existing rates, our sewer rates, are and those kinds of issues to determine how payment would occur on maintaining and upgrading the existing system within the city.

MORRIS: Well, my question just had to do with for a number of years that Battle Ground has been going through a systematic process of examining their existing sewer lines to find out which ones are allowing outside water in --

STANTON: Right.

MORRIS: -- and they've been repairing those. I'm assuming you don't have any of those issues with the sewer lines that have been installed in the last five years or so. So my question really had to do with in your growth areas does the sewage in that area need under any circumstances to pass through those pipes that are not up to snuff that may still in fact have holes in them?

ADAMS: And actually for the most part no, they don't because that whole new system to the west, that's where all this new flow is going to be going to. And I'll just add to that, we have spent several million dollars on our I&I program and we're actually going to have to go back outside of this process and start looking at what remaining pieces do we need to look at for rehabilitation for sewer line. So that's a whole other study, that's something else we're doing, and there's obviously a cost component to that that we want to pick up.

STANTON: Yeah, I understood yours was the I&I question, mine was more along the lines of paying for the collection facilities that will be required for the new sewer system. So am I to understand what you have up there on the chart as the way the money would be raised to meet the parks needs as well as the sewer capital needs is through the impact fees?

ADAMS: Yeah. Impact or SDC's, yes.

STANTON: And the public share, there's no public share in this?

ADAMS: No. It's growth driven.

OSBORN: Growth is paying for the growth.

PRIDEMORE: Does that include your regional facilities charge? I notice you're not saying that you'll be increasing that. Is that sufficient to cover your (inaudible) and planned expansions through there?

ADAMS: That's a whole other financing component that we did not cover in our master plan, but it is covered -- actually it's covered in your master plan for the Salmon Creek Phase 4. Hazel Dell is coming up in a few minutes and they'll be talking through those costs. And we've just started looking at the financing component of that, of that facility, but --

PRIDEMORE: Okay. So the \$4,077 contained here is not an updated calculation, it's just estimated until the final calculations are made; is that right?

ADAMS: Pardon me, what was that again?

PRIDEMORE: You've got 4,077 estimated on your chart.

ADAMS: We've got 3,500 for --

PRIDEMORE: I'm looking at sewer regional facilities charge 4,077 staying at 4,077.

ADAMS: Oh, you're --

LEE: Yeah, earlier this morning before you arrived I submitted the information that you had given to us at the open house last week (inaudible) --

PRIDEMORE: So this is something you guys put together?

LEE: -- the table there.

ADAMS: Oh, okay, you have our table. Thank you. Yeah. Yeah, right now we're assuming that the regional facility charge would stay at the 4,077 with annual increases up to 4,444 which would be in addition to our 3500 SDC.

PRIDEMORE: And that's reflected and calculated growth through the 20 years of the plan?

ADAMS: It's for the next phase of Salmon Creek Phase 4.

PRIDEMORE: All right. But Phase 5 and Phase 6 are contemplated within this 20 years.

STANTON: In the 20 years?

ADAMS: That's correct.

MORRIS: That's the 20 years.

ADAMS: Right now we're looking, and I know Hazel Dell is behind me, they can correct me if I'm wrong, but right now we're looking at that regional facility charge just for the Phase 4 covering those costs in Salmon Creek.

PRIDEMORE: And that's covering 100 percent of the Salmon Creek, your share of the

Salmon Creek expansion?

ADAMS: We're hoping it will.

MORRIS: They have to, it's the way (inaudible).

ADAMS: If it doesn't then our only option is to raise rates and we haven't got to that point in looking over the finance to get to that detail.

PRIDEMORE: I guess what I'm getting to is that your rates are increasing in a lot of different categories here and at some point -- if what I hear from developers is true at some point they just stop building. I think that's probably an exaggeration, but if that occurs then you -- I mean you guys would be dependent on growth in order to pay for the expansions of this, of the plan that we've already got on board, I guess that's that was my only thought on it.

ADAMS: I think what you're seeing even with the Hazel Dell system and their SDC's and everything that sewer is always going to be an expensive component. You can always play with, or I shouldn't say "play," but you can always adjust parks, maybe the stormwater fees and others, but sewer is serious enough that you want to have that component in there and then be able to pay for it so.

PRIDEMORE: If growth were to drop off dramatically in Battle Ground and yet we've already laid out the capital expenditures for expansion of the treatment plant, do you have plans in place to ensure that you'll be able to meet the capital obligation?

ADAMS: We don't have plans in place but I mean we all, we all understand and we're aware that

you'll be going back to the rate payers to pay for those facilities, yeah, until growth comes back. And that's for any system. That's for Vancouver, that's for Hazel Dell. I think we're all very aware that if growth doesn't continue, we'll have some major rate impacts to existing customers.

OSBORN: And those are, those are the questions. As I said we've had a preliminary discussion with Council, they haven't adopted this, as we get more into depth to going through to finalize our plans we'll have those discussions with Council again and Council will discuss whether or not there's going to be a rate increase. The City carries a pretty good reserve, they may opt to, to cover part of the cost out of -- out of that if they can do it, so there are some options.

PRIDEMORE: Do you have just off hand the total dollar value that you're on the hook for the --

ADAMS: Approximately 17 million for Phase 4 of Salmon Creek. And we have applied for a \$10 million Public Works trust fund loan and then we're hoping that we'll have cash in hand to finish the rest off. Stormwater, or I believe it's stormwater is next, yeah, stormwater is next. Really the plan didn't change much for stormwater from the last go-around. Let's see. There was the six-year plan is 2.4 million. The 20 year is 7.3. We worked with County staff and went out into those, the new UGA area, trying to find, see if there was any drainage fixes that needed to occur, couldn't really find any. It's pretty wide open land out there, so we don't have a lot of capital components in the new UGA area. Also in addition to that, our current codes require that development take care of stormwater on their site, that's flow and water quality, so you don't see a lot of the capital components in stormwater. SDC, our System Development Charge, for stormwater remain the same at \$361.

Next is the capital facilities plan for water capital facilities plan, six year is roughly 8.7 million. The 20 year is 10.3 million. The estimated system development charge would go up approximately

\$258, from 1,174 up to 1,432. Just as a note to, our plan talks about having to partner with either CPU or Vancouver to get additional water supply out there in the future. Right now we have enough water rights to take us out to 2018; however, where we get in a little pickle is when it gets real hot out there and our water rights have a threshold of how much you can pump how fast. That's where we kind of bump up against the wall and it looks like our max (inaudible) demands we'll probably have some problems around 2009, that's where we will need to build partnerships with CPU and Vancouver and literally look at being a partner in Vancouver Lake Lowlands and those well fields out there. So just to give you some ideas of what we're looking at for water. Transportation, I'm not sure what to say about transportation because we haven't really --

OSBORN: We're still waiting for a draft.

ADAMS: Yeah, these are -- these must be our old numbers, new numbers kind of.

CARRICO: Existing six-year plan.

ADAMS: Existing. This is just off our existing at \$17 million worth of improvements. The existing impact fee is \$200. We foresee that going up rather significantly with our new plan. So this is just the old stuff for now, more to come in late August.

PRIDEMORE: The work you're doing is focused just on inside the urban growth, the proposed urban growth boundary areas?

ADAMS: For transportation, yeah.

PRIDEMORE: And is that including Meadow Glade, not including Meadow Glade?

OSBORN: It does include Meadow Glade at this time.

PRIDEMORE: And then of the construction costs of that are you assuming a certain percent that the County will pick up versus what the City will pick up?

ADAMS: No. But if you're offering I'd be more than --

PRIDEMORE: I've never been known to offer. So you're assuming that the City through the impact fees and general city taxation will be picking up all of the transportation costs for the expanded UGB?

ADAMS: We haven't gotten into that detail and so I can't -- my assumption right now is, yeah, and through going out for other types of funding, yeah, that would be the way to build your plan.

OSBORN: But to reiterate what Mr. Adams said, we've not seen that level of detail yet from the consultant, but that would be how our other plans are so.

ADAMS: That's it.

MORRIS: I think it's only fair for us to say that we find ourselves in a bit of a bind here because we are supposed to finish our plan and we don't have your transportation element in yet. I don't know whether or not when you signed your contract with your consultant you had a date certain for delivery of your product, I hope so. And I don't know what that date is, but you have left us in a very bad position here.

OSBORN: One of the things that we shared with staff, and we're aware of that, but one of the things that the City has shared with the Commission up front going into this process is that we want to be certain that we could pay for the boundary that's shown and that we're doing good planning and that we can provide service to the folks out there. It's taking a little bit longer than I think anybody's wanted, but nonetheless as I've testified to the Commission before had we not been able to pay for the entire boundary we would have come back and said, hey, we can't pay for it and there's a problem. We still may be there once we see the transportation plan. We still may be there. Once we're done with going through this process with Council we may come back with a proposed change to an urban growth boundary. And so given that, that that work that we still have to wrap up I mean and have a plan that I think that you're comfortable in defending your urban growth boundary because we have done our due diligence. An option for the Commission to consider, to consider is possibly postponing your adoption date 30 days.

STANTON: We have you on tape in February, the end of February, end of April, I mean you were telling us back last fall that if we would delay it until February one time and then April another time that you could have the capital facilities plan done. Granted we did add to your urban growth boundary, that added to your work, but it's really difficult here, especially if you may have some boundary adjustment, for us to be just saying we'll keep on waiting for you.

OSBORN: I understand and I feel your sense of frustration, but as you folks know the mandatory deadline is December, it's a self-imposed deadline that you've put upon yourself and, you know, we've done our best in a four-year process that where we -- we basically had from January of this year till now to put together a fairly complex plan for the one city in the county that's going to experience the largest growth, the largest urban growth boundary expansion of any of the jurisdictions --

PRIDEMORE: Maybe.

OSBORN: -- so we wanted to be sure that we want to do it correct.

STANTON: Just to be fair --

PRIDEMORE: I guess I'm a little frustrated and I -- you have a way of getting me frustrated with your attitude, but you can say that that is a self-imposed deadline. The difficulty is as long as this plan goes on, the more money is expended on trying to get it completed. And I would join in Commissioner Stanton's comments that you guys have promised us this over and over again. I personally was not pleased when we chose to continue this plan further into the future rather than adopting something last year, slapping an urban growth or urban holding zone on it if you couldn't prove up the data, but let's get something done so we're not continuing to spend so much money going through all these exercises. So it's not just a self-imposed deadline, it's a financial issue as well and that concerns me.

I did want to ask one question before we got too far and that was on the parks capital facilities plan you talked about increasing the impact fees. Do you have local match available to meet those obligations on the parks impact fees?

ADAMS: No, we don't.

MORRIS: One hopefully final question. There has been resistance from Meadow Glade to inclusion in your urban growth boundary. Are you receptive to taking them out?

OSBORN: We have had some preliminary discussion with Council, and in fact at the next Council

meeting we will be having that exact discussion and staff is going to be recommending that Meadow Glade -- that Council in their formal action will recommend to the County Commission that Meadow Glade is removed.

MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. Anything else? Okay. Thank you.

OSBORN: Thank you.

MORRIS: Vancouver.

SNODGRASS: Afternoon. For the record, Bryan Snodgrass for the City of Vancouver, joined by Phil Wuest and --

MORRIS: More paper.

STANTON: Go for it, Bryan.

SNODGRASS: Okay. And sorry for just handing that to you right here. And I don't intend to read all of the letter there, there's quite a bit there. What we'd like to do is first I guess thank you for the focus on capital facilities and it appears to us that quite a lot of good additional information has been developed mainly by County staff that can be used for I think all jurisdictions that we didn't have when we established -- when you established the current UGAs back in December and January so we certainly do appreciate that. Overall Vancouver as obviously we all well know faces many of the same problems that the County does regarding capital facilities and what I'd like to do is briefly summarize our plan, what we've adopted, some of the highlights on it, particularly on transportation, certainly the biggest issue, and then touch on some of the kind of regional big picture

issues that we've come across in our plan that we think affect all of the plans and particularly the Vancouver UGA expansion.

We have an adopted plan, it was adopted along with the rest of the comprehensive plan on May 3rd. It sort of consists of several documents. We do appreciate some of the clarifications that staff provided this morning about some of the information contained in the countywide capital facilities summary to the Board, just updating that a little bit, so I won't spend a lot of detail on that because it appears that you do have that letter in the record from us on some of those individual point for clarifications. As summarized in our letter here we do have a number of documents and I think it's particularly important with transportation to recognize that the bulk of our transportation plan is contained within the City's transportation system plan, I think Phil can speak to more detail on that. We do have other separately adopted capital facilities or capital and department plans of various other City departments, so you will find some information in our bound document if you wish to get into the details and some in other sources.

Our plan covers Vancouver city limits and areas served by City services. We have not within those areas changed densities or allowed any land uses to significantly increase the demands on our capital facilities plans beyond what our current plans already call for in our adoption. We estimate that within current city limits we'll probably get somewhere in the range of 176,000 total people counting the folks who are there already through the 20-year period. Certainly annexation would change that and that's just city limits, that doesn't cover the UGA, so that's -- that was sort of the, one of the working assumptions we had. Within that area we estimate our six-year cost at about \$730 million. The largest facing the City of course is transportation, that's estimated at \$187 million costs in the six-year window and \$406 million within the 20-year window. We do have a matching capital facilities plan that does identify revenue sources. As everyone knows and as was talked about this morning briefly, some of those funding sources are sources that are within the

City's current authority to use but are not currently activated, so from a GMA standpoint certainly we believe we have a GMA consistent capital facilities plan and we can talk about in more detail about some of those sources if you wish.

Nonetheless, the overall problem of capital facilities challenge is it's a big one for us and continues to be so. Also a couple of other important points about that. We have as I think well-identified in the County capital facilities summary report lowered levels-of-services on major corridors. I think is also appropriately summarized in that report because we identify levels-of-service not within a range but at a specific number, any change to those shows up as either a lowering or an increase and so certainly it involves using that method makes it certainly more visible when those changes are made and we have lowered some of those levels-of-service on most but not all of our corridors. And we have a policy requiring that we assess our land use plan if capital facilities funding falls short. So those are the -- in an overview that's pretty quick the sort of the overall Vancouver plan. We as I said did adopt it, we haven't had any appeals during our 60-day window which closed last week on that. We did want to if there's -- I can either take those questions now about the Vancouver plan, touch on some of the regional big picture issues that we came across in our plan that we think are important in the final stages of this process.

I think one is that in looking at this data, and particularly looking at some of the recent modeling information from RTC it -- traffic congestion and traffic levels in the projected plan now before you appear to be quite a bit worse than at least we had originally expected looking at the EIS and so forth, and we did include within our letter the RTC memorandum which summarizes some of those and I won't go into detail unless you wish, but the one that stood out to us was that under the proposed land use plan we would have seven times more p.m. peak hours delay of congestion than we did in our 1980 base. So certainly a lot of that's going to happen no matter what decisions you make in terms of growth, but the magnitude was surprising to us. And also the fact that, that it was

quite a bit bigger than what some of the original EIS numbers had shown us at what we would get in terms of some countywide traffic congestion. We don't -- we can't determine from that (inaudible) how that breaks down City and UGA or else-wise, it was a countywide data, but that was of some concern.

And I think as also as we noted in our letter the -- what that modeling reveals is now that the land use plan that you selected back in January has been mapped that the actual expected yield at least used in the transportation analysis was higher than the total which you settled on back in January of about 534,000. The transportation data shows that the yield is likely to be 555,000 which certainly is not only larger than what you had selected before, it's also larger than what the State demographer has projected is most likely here, to occur here over the next 20 years and so that, that certainly is a big part of our concern which we'll address in more detail when the land -- in the land use hearings in a couple of weeks.

A couple other key points. One I think is as well-known CFP. All of our CFPs, ours and the County's and all the other Cities, only cover capital costs and so I think that's well known. Well, what we wanted to do is try and get some sense of what's the magnitude of growth costs that are not covered in a GMA capital facilities plan and just in the admittedly subjective example of Vancouver which is normally built out we asked our finance people about that and they said in the next six years GMA capital facilities costs are only likely to account for about one-sixth of the total costs. So we certainly expected them to be higher, but it -- what this highlights to us is the difference between a GMA compliant plan and the ability of the region to pay for growth are quite different things. We don't know what the number would be countywide or in other circumstances. I think also as we touch on in our letter there was some concern given the magnitude of additional service demands that are going to be placed in a lot of areas particularly on the school districts in the northern part of the proposed Vancouver UGA that the capital facilities plans for those areas which

are adopted by extension under the countywide plans rely on what appear -- would rely on what appears to be a lot of voter levies within the future and I think that it's well-documented and I think appropriately stated in the County's CFP summary that given recent Battle Ground School District history I think the County summary says future voter approvals may not be likely.

So certainly Vancouver's plan does rely on some elements that are not funding sources in terms of transportation that are not in hand, they don't necessarily rely on vote -- voter approval and so that's certainly a concern of ours given the magnitude of additional changes in those areas. Just looking at the County report it looks like that the Battle Ground and Ridgefield School Districts would need to double their enrollments in the next 20 years, according to the report they would need to double their number of facilities in the next 20 years as well, so quite a bit of, quite a bit of change obviously, that's well-documented in the County report.

I think lastly there are a couple more points. State highways, that's a problem for all jurisdictions to properly address those. The given State funding deficits, Vancouver's effort in that regard was to adopt the Environmental Impact Statement by reference. We didn't do any further CFP work because our land use planning didn't place any additional demands on the system. And in looking at some of the RTC data on future modeling for future projected increases, the current UGA plans in front of you countywide would increase congestion on State facilities by about eight and a half times what it was in the year 2000, so certainly that's a concern as well.

Lastly an issue that we'll testify to in a little bit more detail at a future hearing when it's appropriate, but urban holding in terms of using that as a substitute for or an augmentation of a capital facilities plan certainly we very much appreciate the work that's been done about our urban holding, the willingness of staff and others and then and the Board to look at that issue, I think the concern was as currently written that it probably would not form an adequate substitute for capital facilities plan

because it simply required looking at individual developments on a piecemeal basis to make sure that they had urban services rather than looking at what would an individual development if it got urban services would there be capacity left for others in a particular area or would you be needing say major arterial improvements that are improvements added for system efficiency that arguably go beyond just minimum urban service which is what the current language hinges on. So urban holding language isn't necessarily something we propose to discuss today, but that was a concern because it's been discussed very much as a substitute for capital facilities and although we support looking at it, we do recommend that the language be tightened. And that's, that's all we have for you unless there's further questions.

MORRIS: Bryan, what would some of your opportunities for funding be inside the city of Vancouver that you haven't executed yet?

SNODGRASS: Well, we have -- a part of our plan includes a funding appendix which I can give you copies of.

MORRIS: I don't want to read it, just tell me if you would.

SNODGRASS: Okay. Well, I'm going to turn it over to Phil (inaudible) that one.

MORRIS: Okay. Thanks.

WUEST: Some of the mechanism that still have capacity within the city are there's a small amount of sales tax capacity that's out there, there's quite a bit of B&O tax capacity that's out there, there's utility tax capacity, there's capital bonding capacity and there's always a levy lid lift. I think that pretty much covers all the available existing legal mechanisms.

MORRIS: So those would, though, not all require a vote of the people, they certainly would require a majority vote of your City Council?

WUEST: Absolutely. Yeah, there's no question that -- I mean raising funding is a difficult thing to do, but those are the mechanisms that are available.

MORRIS: And where are you relatively to -- relative to your bond limit?

WUEST: I think --

MORRIS: How much capacity do you have left?

WUEST: We -- I don't know that I can tell you exactly, but obviously as the years go on our -- we've got some head room. I know, I believe, that we have enough to cover our transportation capital needs at this point if we were successful actually in getting a 60 percent majority to approve a capital bond levy.

MORRIS: But that would be another voter approved?

WUEST: Yeah, absolutely.

MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. Just in terms of your councilmanic bonds, though, you may need --

WUEST: Councilmanic bonds, there's very little, very little debt capacity available.

MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. Other questions?

PRIDEMORE: Mr. Snodgrass, in making your repeated recommendation that we tighten the urban growth boundary so further did you in making that come to that conclusion do any calculations on what the impact on affordable housing? I don't mean low income housing, I mean just regular mainstream housing, what impact that would have on those costs?

SNODGRASS: Yeah. We've testified to that previously and have provided a number of studies in the record. The -- although the studies certainly aren't unanimous at least in our reading of the main stream opinion on these issues through several studies is that given the safeguards within the overall process, the Growth Management Act and within current land supplies, it does -- certainly doesn't seem likely to us that between now and the next possible updated five years or the next mandatory update in ten years that there is going to be an increase in housing prices caused by the urban boundary decision. Certainly those prices are likely to increase as is current trends, but the basic -- the things we looked at in addition to some of those studies were how much land do we have available. And I haven't seen the latest round of the vacant lands analysis, but certainly a good deal of the land that was established in the '94 plan is still available.

What other -- what other safety valves are there on demand for people who want to move here, one would be that they are able to, that new housing in an expanded urban growth boundary is not the only place to accommodate people. One is building on existing land in the existing urban boundaries or through the small expansions that we're proposing. Another which most people in most communities use is simply buying existing housing or moving into an existing apartment when somebody moves out. So looking at those factors, looking at the -- particularly the possibility that you have of updating the plan in the future if things do get tight and looking at the studies on this led us to our conclusion, but we certainly looked at that issue quite a bit.

PRIDEMORE: When I look at this I, you know, just my basic Economics 101, if you don't have sufficient supply to meet demand, prices do go up. We have seen prices escalate significantly in recent years and, you know, I don't know if that's altogether a bad thing, but I certainly believe that it gets to a point where it is a bad thing where we don't have adequate opportunities for people to afford to live in this county and I don't know that you've adequately (inaudible) through your previous information or this adequately assessed the impacts of a greater, a tighter urban growth boundary. I think right now if, and this is one of the concerns, one of the reasons I would like to have had the plan completed last year, is that we do have a significantly decreased land supply than we had available certainly in 1994. I think that is contributing significantly to the cost increases of land and doing something in terms of an outlet by expanding the UGB I think very modestly through this would help that situation. Just my reflections.

I do have two questions of County staff on Vancouver's information here. He says that the -- what's currently mapped here is 25,000 more per, well, let's get it, 21,000 more than the Board's most recent planning target. My understanding was that we were pretty close to being at the target. Which one of those is true?

LEE: I don't know if you both are true.

PRIDEMORE: I was afraid of that.

LEE: I don't know if you will recall our conversations, oh, a couple of years ago but --

MORRIS: Which conversations were those?

LEE: Regarding the how we go about assessing sort of the control numbers with which we assess the sizing of the urban growth boundaries that we have to take into consideration which is driven by the assumptions which this Board has worked through pretty well.

MORRIS: In night in 2001 we know, we remember the night.

LEE: And actually as early as last summer we bumped up the growth rate from 1.5 to 1.83 percent.

MORRIS: I recall that actually staff had early recommended at least a 1.83.

LEE: I think we had. I think our initial cut at the Planning Commission was 2.1 --

MORRIS: That's what I remember. Thank you.

LEE: -- in 2000. It's been a long time.

MORRIS: (Inaudible) every person who opens their mouth can get in trouble today.

PRIDEMORE: We have 25,000 more map to go.

LEE: But then there is a distinction when you establish sort of the control numbers that lead to the boundary description and then you apply the zoning on property. And the zoning on property the assumption is if it's zoned, it can be built and that is where you get the run up between the 555,000 that Bryan has which is reflected in the transportation analysis zone allocations that we use for capital facilities analysis versus the control total of 534,191 overall population in 2023.

MORRIS: And I guess I haven't understood in my eight years on this Board why you use different figures for those. I've tried to add my query answer by RTC staff and they can't do it for me and you haven't done it for me, and RTC staff says, well, we get our numbers from the County and County says, well, it's the TAZ model. So it's like it would be just as useful for the three of us to pick a number. Of course you don't know how good we are at picking numbers, but we might as well just pick one and say that's the number that we use for all calculations. But did you get your question answered?

PRIDEMORE: I don't think I did, but I'm sure he tried.

LEE: I did say to both.

PRIDEMORE: I'll try to get conversation outside of the hearing to try to understand that better. The second point was on the comments regarding the urban holding policies, my understanding of what the draft was did not allow for development to go forward in an area for individual piecemeal approval. I mean that essentially the urban holding had to be lifted off the whole area, not just specifics; is that not correct?

LEE: I think that is certainly the intent that we discussed at the June 30 work session with the new language. I don't know that it says explicitly that we should look on an area wide basis, although it is designated as a Type IV process because we thought it merited the policy review level.

LOWRY: Right. But not only Type IV but also one that can only be initiated by the Board.

PRIDEMORE: I think we do need to have something on an area wide basis, not site-specific removal of the urban holding designation.

MORRIS: Well, the language is right here and it says a subarea plan. A subarea plan --

PRIDEMORE: That's the old.

LEE: That is outdated language.

MORRIS: Oh, all right. But this is the one the City of Vancouver likes?

SNODGRASS: The older one we prefer because it was more comprehensive.

PRIDEMORE: But -- and my only issue again, I don't want to put back in the requirement for a subarea plan just because I know how difficult it's been to get any of those funded, but the idea behind the urban holding zone is based on an area, it's not based on specific site or parcel-specific kinds of things and it, the urban holding policy, in my opinion should not allow for what Vancouver is describing here. And if it does, then I think it needs to be changed to close off the possibility. Do you see what I'm saying?

LEE: Yes.

STANTON: It's approaching -- we talked a little bit about it at the work session. My concern had been also that if we did it project-by-project, it would be first come, first serve the capacity as opposed to looking at an area where you plan for the needs, a sewer line, a water line, roads to serve an area.

PRIDEMORE: You're definitely not going to get the cross-circulation through that kind of a

development. And I think -- I don't -- again I don't feel like I want to go to the subarea plan but that is essentially necessary, some level of that is necessary in order to remove the urban holding to me.

MORRIS: I have a question, Mr. Snodgrass, and it's almost I always want to ask it of staff too, I know I'll never get an answer that I like but I keep saying it out loud. I am repeatedly intrigued by some sort of a disassociation in people's minds, particularly the City of Vancouver's, between the number of people and the size of the boundary and perhaps you're suggesting that the population figure should be reduced and the boundary pulled in, but the people are the people, they still have their children who go to school, they still get in their car in the morning to drive someplace, we can't be certain which direction, though we believe we have models that will tell us, and they are still going to push the handle on the potty, whether they are 20 blocks north or they are 20 blocks south they're going to have and exhibit that behavior, so I'm always interested in some sort of a supposition that you're going to have less traffic congestion if you pull the boundary in. I have always -- that has always seemed counter intuitive to me that you will have less congestion because you pull the boundaries in, you're going to have just more people and the same number of people in the same number of cars.

SNODGRASS: Well, perhaps maybe that's an issue we can address a little more in detail on the land use side, but I think certainly -- I mean our testimony aside I think the County documents and the staff documents pretty clearly and appropriately indicate that more larger boundaries, more expenses, more capital facility expenses, I can't remember the exact quote in the summary report before you.

MORRIS: I remember it, that's why I'm always wanting to ask staff. So tell me how that happens that you're going to need fewer schools, you're going to need less sewage treatment plant. You may need a few less miles of sewer pipe, but that's just in big places.

SNODGRASS: I guess just in terms of the number of people coming in, and I think Phil will probably address the traffic congestion issues better than I, but just does the land use plan and the UGA size affect the number of people coming here and there I think the -- I would say that the evidence in the record of what's happening in other cities is pretty conclusive that you need -- growth is driven by both supply and demand and certainly --

MORRIS: Absolutely.

SNODGRASS: -- a number of people will want to come to Vancouver. And that's great, we should consider that, but how large a land --

MORRIS: Or the county.

SNODGRASS: The county, excuse me, yes. -- how large a land supply to accommodate those number of people is certainly a big policy question, and cities or regions that exhibit very fast growth rates, as fast as ours or faster, are almost all those areas that are adding or have lots of available land. Cities or counties or regions that have very low growth rate sometimes it's because of poor economics but often it's also simply because they're built out and they're not adding land. The city of -- one example that I sort of like to use that staff is probably sick of hearing is that the City of Seattle who we do not want to look like, I'm not suggesting that, but they grew at about a half a percent a year in the '90s and they were trying very hard to do in-fill, much harder than we here probably are or should. If you're not adding land you simply won't grow as much. I think there's quite a lot of evidence of that. You will grow but not as much.

PRIDEMORE: Isn't the -- the reason for that is because if you don't add sufficient supply to meet

demand, the prices rise until demand decreases and I mean that's what the real driving thing is is that you're discouraging people from moving here by having prices go up.

MORRIS: High prices.

SNODGRASS: Well, I think even if there was no price increase the mere fact that adding more land would create more opportunities for people to move here. And so the amount of land I believe looking at this stuff, and this is one person's opinion, that the amount of land you add regardless of price is going to make a huge impact on the number of people that come here. And certainly that's reflected in the technical part of the work that's been done in the last four years. Larger expansions, larger capacity (inaudible).

PRIDEMORE: Now you have to give me the economic theory book that would prove that up because it's not within my understanding of how economics works or supply/demand works so a bigger challenge for you to educate me on that.

MORRIS: Anything else?

STANTON: Now I'm not sure I can even figure out the question that I had written down, but it refers back to a comment that staff made in the staff report about the sewer projects inside the city of Vancouver, that there was \$91 million projected over 20 years, but we didn't have a list of projects or any information about what that was to go to.

SNODGRASS: Yeah, let me get back to you on that, I'm not familiar with the issue.

STANTON: Okay. Thanks.

MORRIS: Thank you. Oh, Phil, I'm sorry.

WUEST: Well, again, I mean I doubt if you've been asking this question for a couple of years and don't have a satisfactory answer, I doubt that I can answer it. I guess all I would say is that there are a variety of reasons that if the boundary is smaller, the impacts on the transportation side would be marginally less and I would look to the EIS that was done to evaluate the alternatives that demonstrates that and you can believe or not believe the results. Again, nobody argues that with any of the scenarios small or no boundary expansion to large the impacts are huge, it's a question of at the margin and that's where you see the difference.

MORRIS: Yeah, okay, thank you. Okay. Thank you. We are ready now I believe for the Hazel Dell Sewer District. Just start whenever you'd like.

MCDONALD: Good afternoon. I'm Chuck McDonald, the District Engineer with the Hazel Dell Sewer District. I want to thank the Commissioners for allowing us to come. Also here today is our General Manager Bob Bandarra, as well as one of our Commissioners, Commissioner Neil Kimsey, in the audience. We'll speak quickly and briefly to cover our portion of this and I provided you with handouts that you can use directly in front of you as well as electronically for the audience.

Real quickly, the Hazel Dell Sewer District is a special purpose district operating under RCW 57 and as a special purpose district we have restrictions relative to spending money outside of our boundary for any purpose including planning. We've done draft --

MORRIS: We've lost you.

LEE: Oh, it's back on now.

MCDONALD: We have done draft preliminary planning in relation to the anticipated boundary changes that the County is proposing and once the actual adoption is made, then the District will be moving forward with doing final planning that has to be submitted to Ecology, so I just wanted to bring that to your attention. We've looked at the areas that the County is reviewing and broken them into basically five different areas starting at the west and kind of moving in a clockwise circuit, so I'll just touch briefly on each of those areas. The first map here is just an overall map of the area that is impacted at the district which is north of the current district boundary. The first area is an area that is north of 149th pretty much located between NE 10th and NW 11th Avenue. It's an area that is adjacent to other boundaries. On your map there are several different lines. The black line is the current urban boundary that is, was adopted previously, the blue line is the anticipated boundary that the district had or the blue boundary is our basin boundaries that the district has following topography, and the red line is the new proposed boundary that the County is reviewing. All of this area the District can readily serve based on our current comprehensive plan with anticipated pump stations, those are the red stars, there are pump stations that we've got in our 20, in our current 20-year plan that would be proposed at some time based on development and they would serve the bulk of the area. The northwest corner of this area is one that would be the most difficult to serve due to topography. If the Commissioners were open to looking at revising the boundary that they're looking at, we would make a proposal of sliding that line west to NW 11th Avenue. That way gravity service could be propagated to the existing pump stations that would be installed and not have to install lines outside of urban areas.

MORRIS: Excuse me just a minute, Mr. McDonald. I don't have a good fix in my mind on the geography from that small piece of the map. Pat, could you put up the larger map so we can see, when he says if you would move that line so we can see it in relationship to everything else.

LEE: Actually I would go with the big one. I think the big one's probably better since we're going to cover a lot of different areas.

MCDONALD: I've got a laser pointer but I don't-- I can't point it at you.

MORRIS: Maybe if you can just point it out on this one that would be all right.

LEE: Oliver, do you want to show the general area we're talking about right now.

MORRIS: But what is it that you're asking, then, to change?

MCDONALD: The first area is this area right here.

MORRIS: Yes. Okay.

MCDONALD: The recommendation is that you would move to this NW 11th Avenue is this line right here.

MORRIS: You want it to move west a little bit?

MCDONALD: So move west. It's approximately I think about NW 4th, NW 5th Avenue is where it's proposed.

MORRIS: So that's move the UGB to the west; is that what you're suggesting?

MCDONALD: We were looking at it strictly for simplicity in serving for sanitary sewer.

MORRIS: I see. And is that just because you can run it down 11th or what is it?

MCDONALD: 11th Avenue --

MORRIS: I see.

MCDONALD: -- and due to the topography that's in the area.

MORRIS: Well, help me, Mr. Lowry. Why can't he just run it down the street anyway?

MCDONALD: We could --

LOWRY: Go ahead.

MCDONALD: We could run that as a proverbial tight line, but then the experience that District staff and planning staff always encounters is the people in the area that come into the County Commissioners want to be able to tie into that line because it's there anyway.

LOWRY: And so there's County case that they can't --

MCDONALD: So we tried to --

LOWRY: -- can't stand to serve people outside of the UGA.

MORRIS: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: But if we --

MORRIS: It wouldn't be serving, it would be just running it down the street.

PRIDEMORE: Right. If it was for the sake of convenience and we don't allow anybody to attach on laterals, which of course when they come walking in here we will so it's maybe academic but --

MCDONALD: We tried to keep all of us out of that.

MORRIS: But it is just a pragmatic issue. It's there's nothing really legal that would prevent you from running it down the street?

MCDONALD: Nothing that I'm aware of. We could install that, it's just --

MORRIS: Okay. Yeah, okay. Thanks.

PRIDEMORE: Would it present a greater financial hardship because you wouldn't have people attaching to it, you wouldn't have those people paying in for the capital?

MCDONALD: That would not be a financial hardship. The hardship that would be potentially involved would be a developer would have to install a temporary interim pump station and pay full cost that would eventually go offline. So there would be cost impacts to a developer to develop that northwest corner of that area in question so, just the area, and you can see on your topography maps that you have in front of you, just that little corner on it is the one that would be very difficult to

serve.

PRIDEMORE: That's the piece that we've talked about leaving in five-acre minimums anyway, wasn't it? Is that Banbury?

MORRIS: I think Banbury's inside of that a little bit, but it, that may, could be Banbury.

PRIDEMORE: So (inaudible) that northwest corner (inaudible).

LEE: Yeah, Banbury is just inside of what's currently proposed so this would include an area a little to the west of that.

MCDONALD: The next area is up the just the Old Discovery corridor, I don't know if they've changed the name, I think this one's probably a little more straightforward. Again the majority of this area will serve to existing lines and I've tried to show that. Again the blue is the extension of district current drainage basins so the blue area would serve to existing lines on both sides of Interstate 5. The purple would go to new pump stations that the District would need to construct as a new, as new general facilities for these areas. So again this is the Whipple Creek area on both sides of I-5, one area north of the Fairgrounds, the other area between I-5 and the Whipple Creek corridor.

MORRIS: And you pay for this through system development charges; is that right?

MCDONALD: We would pay for pump stations and forced mains through system development charges.

MORRIS: Development charges, okay.

MCDONALD: The general line extensions would be paid for by developers.

PRIDEMORE: And is this kind of an expansion consistent with how you would expect --

MCDONALD: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: -- normally? There's nothing --

MCDONALD: The next one is just an expansion of the remainder of this north area and it's just on the east side of the Whipple Creek corridor so it's the area north of 179th Street between Whipple Creek and NE 29th Avenue. And again virtually all of this area would gravity flow into existing lines via line extensions by developers. There are a few low areas that would have to be reviewed in more depth, but the majority of this area would be readily serviceable.

The next area is the area out towards Pleasant Valley and this is bounded by 119th on the south, 50th Avenue on the west and 72nd Avenue with the little other portion there just east of 72nd Avenue. This area again as you can see by the blue lines is in part of the current district's drainage basins so it will again be served by line extensions from lines that are existing in place to the west. As we move further to the east towards what is the Curtin Creek corridor we get into a location where we have done some minor planning that would require a pump station, again a new pump station to serve this area located towards the north at about the 77th Avenue area. So to give you a real quick idea of where that is, basically someplace in this area right here would be where an ultimate pump station would be installed to serve this area. That would again lead us if we are looking at expanding the boundary only for the purposes of sanitary sewer simplicity to look at

extending this area to Curtin Creek on the east and basically to the top of the ravine of Salmon Creek to the north, that would make it most simple to serve for sanitary sewer purposes.

MORRIS: Would you point that out with your light.

MCDONALD: You bet. The Curtin Creek corridor shows up here on the east is basically about right here and then we would be looking at a pump station someplace in this area to pick up the west. The eastern side of the area that you're looking at, the bulk of it will go to the west, but until it starts dropping off a bit Salmon Creek, and this is Salmon Creek coming along here, that is the lowest area in this area. So if, you know, again on a purely gravity type installation process that would be the most logical best location for the ultimate pump station. So again we'd be looking at interim pump stations required by the developers to build until we -- the boundaries are expanded to that final point.

The next area is the area that's just south of 119th. This is that kind of island area that's bounded by to some extent Curtin Creek, the railroad runs through the center of it. This entire area has several lines along the south boundary that are capable of being extended and so this area is readily serviceable merely by line extensions from the south. And the green lines are the existing lines that are in the ground.

And then the last area is the area that's around SR-503 and 119th Street. The District has current trunk lines in at just to the west of SR-503 and approximately 104th Street. That line is capable of serving the bulk of the area to the east. As we move to the far east of this area that the County is looking at towards 152nd Avenue, this is the area that's most difficult to serve for both the District as well as the City of Vancouver, either of us would have to serve this with a new pump station in this area. And the area is very flat. If the County was looking at drawing back a boundary, this

would be from again a gravity strictly sanitary sewer service basis the area that would make the most sense to draw back is this east edge in this area. And the District does have a general facility charge that pays for its general facilities, primarily the pump stations and forced mains. The oversizing or overdepth that may be necessary for trunk lines is paid for by the District, the remainder is paid for by the developers.

And we normally update that calculation on a yearly or biannually basis. We anticipate that this will not be substantially impacted. The current general facility charge is \$1,898 per equivalent residential unit and the improvements that we're looking at are approximately two and a half million dollars. And that's all I have from the District.

MORRIS: Okay. I guess you have a list.

PRIDEMORE: I guess I'd like to follow up, Chuck, just on the Battle Ground situation and just two areas. One, could you talk about the situation of Meadow Glade and what you see as sewer related issues or barriers to development of the Meadow Glade area. And then second on the regional facilities charge and what the citizens of Battle Ground and Hazel Dell Sewer District can expect in terms of the regional facilities charge over the next 20 years.

MCDONALD: I'll touch briefly on those, John will probably touch on them from a more dollars and cents perspective on an overall cost. The Meadow Glade area, the District provides service to the Meadow Glade area following a transfer from Clark County back in the late '90s. The District has been serving that. Due to some changes that were done at in the rural center task force process there has been some increase in density in some areas, we anticipate that they will not negatively impact the overall service to Meadow Glade; however, as you're probably well aware the Meadow Glade area has the most density is one-acre parcels and it goes up to two and a half and five-acre parcels from that, so it does have limitations as compared to an urban area.

The system that's in place has a septic tank effluent pump system, a STEP system, was never anticipated to take type -- the urban type densities that one would think of with annexation into Battle Ground, so the discussions we've had briefly with Battle Ground is that they would be looking at annexing that when they have normal gravity provisions available. And the other issue that rolls into that is that the groundwater while not precluding gravity sewer does make it more difficult. And the topography normally is going away from the city of Battle Ground, that's why the initial design of that whole area was to go directly to the Salmon Creek plant and not go back up to Battle Ground on that, that was a result of Battle Ground's issues with their sewer. So as a status quo I don't see that there's any issues right now with the process. If Battle Ground elects to move ahead with annexation, then I don't know how they're going to go about that process other than as I had mentioned earlier that what they've told us is they want to have gravity sewer available and move away from the STEP systems and I don't know if that's feasible or not.

The other option, then, would be to go with additional lines in the ground to increase that density and just basically parallel the existing system that's in place. On the regional facility charge side the --

PRIDEMORE: Before we move off of that, Chuck, just on the because that, I guess that's my concern is my thinking has always been that if Meadow Glade were to be designated as an urban area and develop at a higher density, it would be significantly more cost effective to serve that area with sewer rather than with the STEP system and I don't know where the break even is. I know we still carry debt on the old STEP system and so from the beginning of this process I have been focused as on one of many issues, but one of them is getting Meadow Glade to that point where it could be effectively served by sewer. So that's the focus of my question is is that a practical thing for me to be trying to do or should I say this is hopeless and Meadow Glade should just stay the way

it is?

MCDONALD: Well, Meadow Glade is on sewer, they are served by sewer at this time.

PRIDEMORE: The STEP system?

MCDONALD: The STEP systems are a recognized full service sewer sewage process. It's our -- the way the process works is all of their liquid is pumped to Battle Ground and then pumped down to the Salmon Creek plant and then the District is responsible for all their solids, all their septic tanks, similar to what Camas does. So we've got a seven-year program that where we go out on a rotating basis and check those septic tanks and do ongoing maintenance on those as necessary. To date in that, those, that system began going into place I think it was either late '93 or '94, now I can't remember, we've only had one failure of a tank out there.

PRIDEMORE: I remember -- well, I'm just trying to get to the cost effectiveness over time what should be done with the Meadow Glade area. Should we just accept this as the best system for that area or should we -- would increasing densities there making it a truly urban area and fitting it with full service sewer be a better --

MCDONALD: I think it would make sense to increase it in the long, in the long run, and it would be most feasible to just have a gravity system come basically south with topography and then pump from there. Not pump back to Battle Ground but have its own dedicated force main to pump into the system or other options that Battle Ground is looking at for treatment on this --

PRIDEMORE: And is that cost effective in this comp plan update or is that something further out?

MCDONALD: It's -- I would anticipate it's further out than at this point. The biggest concern I would have is that the -- again I can't really speak for Battle Ground, but the little bit of information that we've received is they would be looking at doing a potential ULID out there while the overall increase in housing in Meadow Glade is a higher level than some of the original was I don't think any of those people, especially the original residents, had any anticipation of ever having to pursue a ULID in that area to pay for it. So that would be a pretty tough pill to swallow I would think. And your other question is the outstanding bonds have all been paid on Meadow Glade at this time, there's no outstanding debt.

PRIDEMORE: Oh, they are?

MCDONALD: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: Oh, okay. Then another thought on this is are there portions of Meadow Glade, particularly I'm thinking to the east along 503, where inclusion of those portions into the UGB before -- I mean is it -- there's some large parcels there, bringing them into the UGB and having them develop at an urban level would be easier to service than leaving it as a rural center and developing at these lower densities. So is it possible to kind of separate the Meadow Glade area and take a chunk of it?

MCDONALD: That would -- that might make the most sense based on again what little I know about Battle Ground's overall plan. They do have some pump stations located -- they've got one just north of the central Meadow Glade system and they were looking at another one that would be due east of the corner you're talking about and they had already included that in their urban area as zoned as multi residence and so that was one of the areas across from the grade school and middle school that I thought they were going to move ahead on. And if they do move ahead with that pump

station, it would seem to make sense. But again long range, with the topography it would make more sense to look at gravitying and keeping the pipes as shallow as possible due to groundwater conditions to run all of that flow to the south, at some time have a centrally located pump station and go from there. But again you're probably looking at some considerable costs to do that with the existing zoning that's out there at one acre and two and a half acre lots.

PRIDEMORE: I've heard Battle Ground say some things to the effect of they just -- they weren't going to take any of Meadow Glade. Is there some middle ground here that makes sense for the sewer issues at least that some of that area could come in? I guess that's one of the things I want to look at next month.

MCDONALD: And I, yeah, I would think that the north areas where they have already sewer right on the boundary would make a lot of sense.

And then really quickly before John finishes, the regional facility charge is, it's set at 4,077, it's slated to increase the first of 2005, I don't remember the exact number, it's 4264 rings a bell, and then the year after that, 2006, it will be at 4444. And in past sewer summits we've had, all the elected officials have been reluctant to want to move past that number of 4,444, so that's the number that we're kind of working around that John can discuss with the consultants as far as trying to make that number work. As Sam Adams talked, the individual partners are trying to obtain as much low cost funding as possible and the District has obtained a 10 million and a \$1 million PWTF loan at half percent interest, and we're also trying to get State revolving funds through Ecology this summer, and then again Battle Ground is also pursuing funding, so we're trying to make that impact as comfortable as possible on our new residents.

PRIDEMORE: I had completely forgotten that we did that, adopted several fees when we approved

the RFC last time. We had approved those increases over years. I, yeah, I had forgotten that. Thank you.

PETERSON: I'm going to address the County side of the sewer system in this area, the Salmon Creek Wastewater Management System that we've come to call it. As you're aware the County owns a regional wastewater transmission and treatment system in the lower Salmon Creek drainage and the County doesn't have any retail customers for sanitary sewer, but they provide service to two wholesale customers, the Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Battle Ground. Most of the District's flow, approximately 80 percent, flows to the Salmon Creek plant and 100 percent of Battle Ground's sewage flows to the Salmon Creek plant, the remaining balance of the District's flow flows to the City of Vancouver's west side treatment plant. The three jurisdictions together have been working intensely over the last approximately 18 months to develop the plan for expansion of the County system consistent with the GMA process occurring in parallel and in March this year we produced a draft planning document, and it looked a lot like this, and put that out for review by all the affected local jurisdictions and have received comments back and incorporated those comments in this document which we're -- which is the final planning document including those comments and we have submitted this document to two State Departments, Department of Ecology and Department of Health for their regulatory review.

With respect to the GMA work in particular as we updated our planning parameters three different times over that 18 months as the boundaries were being developed and defined and one item that became apparent for the County system which is essentially a regional system for that area of the county is that the specific boundaries, the specific densities and how those are drawn or redrawn really don't dramatically affect the overall sizing and need at the Salmon Creek plant. It's a regional system less sensitive to those specifics, but driven essentially by the total population served in that area, not so much where they are, how dense they are, but just I believe as Commissioner Morris

indicated earlier that they exist in the system and make contributions on a regular basis. With the existing County system which was expanded --

STANTON: I know I was thinking the same thing.

PRIDEMORE: There's contributions to the system.

STANTON: I had never heard that before, that was really well said, John.

PETERSON: Let's stay away from sewer jokes.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, I think that's what I said last time, the only people that keep hoping that things keep going downhill.

PETERSON: The County as you're aware expanded their system with the Phase 3 expansion that was completed in the late 1990s. At that time the district made up approximately 81 percent of the flow to the Salmon Creek facility with Battle Ground making up the balance of 19 percent. We're looking at that shift changing slowly over time as Battle Ground has grown proportionately faster than the district service area. So not only does the need at the Salmon Creek facility increase overall, but Battle Ground becomes a little bit larger portion of that total over time. For Phase 4 we're estimating that there will be 23 percent of the County's flow at the facility and the district would be the balance or 77 percent.

In summarizing the 20-year plan, the Phase 3 project that was built and finished approximately five years ago resulted in the County plant having a rated capacity of 10.3 million gallons per day. Our plan is for a series of expansions over the next 20 years, Phase 4, Phase 5 and Phase 6. I believe

there were comments earlier to the effect that Phase 4 would last for 20 years and I want to make that clear, that's not the case, Phase 4 is just the first of three phases for 20 years, and on the planning summary handout I've provided for the Board I listed the estimated cost in 2004 dollars as well as the result in total capacity of the County system at each step going from 15 to 18 to 26 million gallons per day over that 20-year period. The County owns five different components there, there's some pipelines, pump stations, pressure lines, the plant itself and the outfall, and there's a sort of a leapfrogging program for how each piece as it gets near its capacity needs to be expanded over the life of those three expansions, but the net result is approximately \$120 million investment over that 20-year period and the facility increasing to about two and a half times its current capacity over that 20 years.

If you stand back and look at the overall map and where the bulk of those new areas are in Battle Ground and the north end of the District service area, that's almost all entirely tributary to the Salmon Creek facility so this facility bears the brunt to some degree of the expansion of the urban boundaries. There were a lot of options and ideas considered in the plan and the plan was to stay with the County system for Phase 4 because the need for capacity was, was short with respect to time, but there are a number of options that were considered and are considered viable options for the future that could affect that Phase 5 or 6 project that may change the scale of the project. It may defer the need a certain amount of time. The two most prominent are a potential interconnection with the City of Vancouver's system to where a significant block of flow could be diverted to and capacity purchased at the west side facility and/or the City of Battle Ground is conducting some high level feasibility studies to determine at what point in time it may make sense to reconstitute treatment of their sewage or a portion of their sewage in at their -- at their abandoned treatment facility. There are new technologies available that are becoming cost effective that may allow them to consider on a 10 or 20-year horizon treating a portion of their own waste in Battle Ground, and to the extent that anything like that ever became reality it would take pressure off of the County

system.

And just a few brief comments about implementation. We've essentially completed our planning work, we're moving forward aggressively with respect to the schedule. We're entering the permitting and financing areas later this year with a plan to design all of the improvements by this time next year and construct the improvements in 2005, '6 and '7, so that Phase 4 project would be on-line our target is 2007, our fallback year is about 2008 before that system is close to or exceeding its current capacity, so there's no float in that overall schedule. That's just a quick summary, but I'd be happy to answer questions or talk about the connection charges a little bit more.

MORRIS: I have a fairly theoretic question. The difficulty even if we didn't have any growth at all are changes to the standards for the eventual discharge of the effluent into the waterways. Is there any -- I mean is technology emerging that would make that easier to meet and to make siting of new sewage treatment facilities easier because we have no outfall areas unless we have advances in technology?

PERTERSON: Correct. There are some clear trends within the industry. Let me take one quick step back. We have the luxury as do most of the cities in Clark County that we neighbor the Columbia River and for a sewage discharger that's still the best option of any, so we're blessed in that respect. But there are emerging technologies, primarily membrane treatment systems, that have been used in the drinking water industry for years and years and years and now are being adapted to sewage applications. And a long story short, what that gives you is the ability to produce a very high quality effluent with the idea that you can find some type of reuse groundwater injection, irrigation, some way that you can treat that water to a high level of quality and reuse it in those areas. The term "scalping plants" is becoming popular to where rather than these regional systems that transport the raw material over long distances and have regional treatment plants that there are

targeted areas where you can scalp a block of flow out of the system, treat it and reuse it at some point of reuse without having to build the infrastructure to convey and treat that over time. And that's happening in especially the more arid portions of the country, the South and West. Western Oregon and Washington may be the last areas that feel the need to produce the reuse water, but that trend is clearly developing and may -- it's essentially what Battle Ground's concept is built over, you know, the long-term before they commit to bringing another --

PRIDEMORE: So how -- I mean I keep thinking with water rights issues and everything else that's coming up, inflow streams and that that time is not very far where whether we're an aridary or not, we're going to need to look at that. Just two questions: How far are we from that, and, two, are you talking about something short of full tertiary treatment? Is this something --

PETERSON: It actually exceeds tertiary treatment. It would meet most current drinking water standards and the technologies exist today that are used in a few places around Washington today where the need is significant. It's a new technology so the unit price, the cost, is high currently and it's difficult to make it cost effective when existing technologies will still suffice, but that is changing rapidly as that technology becomes utilized. And I would say it's currently a viable technology, over a five to ten-year horizon that will become more popular and it may be an integral part of the business on the 10 to 20 year type horizon. Interestingly, one of the biggest drawbacks is that regulations tend to follow and they don't really recognize yet what these technologies can do and so it becomes somewhat difficult at times in terms of having more creative solutions that don't fall within the boundaries of the framework of the existing regulations.

PRIDEMORE: So if we're talking in 10 to 20 years is it worth it for the District to consider that as part of this comp plan update?

PETERSON: Well, that's one reason for this phased approach, so that we're only taking steps we know we have to today and that we would look at all these options again at Phase 5 before --

PRIDEMORE: Again, I'm not looking at it so much in terms of the current treatment plant so much as maybe the Battle Ground system, you know, just talking about the Meadow Glade, I mean is there some alternatives with that that might make it easier than going, you know, running a gravity line all the way up Salmon Creek, something that might be more cost effective or getting close to being as cost effective as doing that?

PETERSON: Yeah. Battle Ground has done one very high level study and is currently taking the next step of additional definition looking at how these issues might affect their future on that before they would commit to the Phase 5 project so it's being sincerely and seriously studied at this time.

STANTON: Just to get through the Phase 4, though, you mentioned a change in percentage where Battle Ground would be consuming more of the flow. Is there available capacity in the Phase 4 effort for both the growth in Hazel Dell and in Battle Ground?

PETERSON: Correct.

STANTON: There is?

PETERSON: Yes. We are planning the Phase 4 capacity to meet the anticipated demand for both the sewer district and the city. We planned it for their needs separately and just simply added those values together to determine the size of the Phase 4 expansion. So Battle Ground's needs through Phase 4 can be met in the County's system. Am I answering your question?

STANTON: Okay. Yes. And then Phase 4 would last until about what year?

PETERSON: Approximately 2013.

STANTON: 2013. Thanks.

MORRIS: Anything else? It's been fun having you here because we have heard from all of the jurisdictions repeatedly, we've heard from the school districts repeatedly, we haven't heard all that much from the special purpose districts and it's been an interesting conversation, you've been very informative. Thank you.

PETERSON: Thank you. Appreciate the opportunity.

MORRIS: Okay. Our court reporter needs a break so we will break for ten minutes.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MORRIS: Okay. Are we ready to start again? Next we're going to hear from Clark Public Utilities. And we are supposed to finish at 4:00 so I think the Board's going to have to restrain ourselves from questions because it's just too inviting with our last panel.

BECK: Hello. I'm Eric Beck with Clark Public Utilities, I'm Engineering Manager for the water utility and had a very big part in the capital facilities plan. I put a map up on the overhead here that shows our water service boundary. It basically we serve about 495-square miles, we've got 600 miles of water main in there, so we basically serve most of the areas within our water service boundary that you've already designated for the urban growth expansion except for the

La Center Junction and I think the Tribe there has got some plans there that would want to extend water service out there in the future also, so all those areas are served.

The primary concern I guess that the utility is looking at is water supply or source and I was happy to hear that Hazel Dell Sewer has taken care of that for us with their membrane bioreactors. But, no, the biggest thing is source and we are constantly looking for additional supply. We've got probably enough supply to take care of the next three to four years and then basically we need to find another source. And what we've been doing is working with Vancouver looking at a supply in the Vancouver Lake Lowlands and that is it's going to take about three years to get that supply back into our system. There's some challenges down there, there's contaminants, there's environmental issues, there's minerals and other issues that need to be addressed, but that has got the biggest supply for Clark County, that can be the supply for the future for Clark County and it's capable of -- one site was capable of 36 million gallons per day, that would take, take care of the County's growth for about 40 years just in our service area. So that's what we're working on at this time and that's what we've got in our capital facilities plan and proposing on working on the next 5 and 20 year component of that. Do you have any questions other than that?

MORRIS: Wow, thank you. Appreciate it.

BECK: Okay. Is that all?

MORRIS: You're free to go.

BECK: Oh, I love it. Thanks a lot. That was too quick.

MORRIS: We delight in people who are efficient and talk (inaudible). Now we're ready for the

schools.

SAHLER: Good afternoon. Thanks for having us here. Carra Sahler from Preston, Gates & Ellis representing the Consortium of Clark County School Districts. I have with me Lynn Hicks, the Assistant Superintendent from the Battle Ground School District, as well as Todd Horenstein, an Assistant Superintendent for the Vancouver School District. I want to thank Sandra Towne, Derek Chisholm and Jose Alvarez and Ken Pearrow for their assistance in preparing the information you have in front of you regarding the school districts' capital facilities supplementary information. As you know each of the school districts submitted a 2003 to 2009 capital facilities plan, so the information we submitted this just this past month is supplementary to that. Before Lynn and Todd answer any questions you may have about their respective capital facilities needs, I want to just make sure that you received Evergreen School District's request that you move the property located at 19702 SE 1st Street into the Vancouver UGA. I hope you received that letter. If you don't, I have extra copies for you.

STANTON: We got it.

SAHLER: In addition I wanted to confirm that you received our letter regarding the policy proposed by the Consortium, okay. I wanted to put in another plug for that policy and make sure that I'm available if you have any questions about it. And finally, please consider as part of the comprehensive plan update allowing elementary schools in residential zones. As you can tell from the information we submitted, most of the school districts are expecting to need to construct at least two elementary schools in the next 20 years. As you can imagine time and cost efficiencies will be saved if you allow schools outright in residential areas. Do you have any questions for me regarding the capital facilities information we submitted for school districts other than Battle Ground or Vancouver? Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

HICKS: Hi. I'm Lynn Hicks from Battle Ground School District, Associate Superintendent, and thanks for the opportunity to talk with you again. I was hoping that I would be here with really good news that our bond had passed and that we were -- had turned the corner and we're on our way to handling our growth but as you know it didn't. We plan to run it again and the most likely date will be February 2005. We've discussed it with our Board and with our community and that seems to be what the consensus is. That puts us behind in our efforts to deal with the growth that we already have. We plan to open our first school in the fall of 2006, the second school in the fall of 2007. Now it looks like if we pass in February the earliest that we could open our first K-8 would be the fall of 2007. That's if everything, everything goes great.

You know, we're currently growing at the rate of about two and a half to three percent a year which is about 350 to 400 students a year. That we estimate that at about 2,400 students over the next six years, but the capital facilities plan update which you've received from us calculates the growth based on the changes in the urban growth boundary and it shows us conservatively growing by 3,200 students or the higher rate of 3,700 students. So, yes, we are very concerned about the projected growth and about our District's ability to handle -- pass bonds to handle that growth. If we pass our \$55 million bond in February, we would just shortly have to turn around and ask our community to pass another bond, probably about another 35 to \$40 million bond, and probably we'd have to ask that within two to three years of just passing the \$55 million one which is the largest bond that we've ever asked our community to pass. We figure that would add another 50 to 70 cents per thousand to their assessed evaluation. The question that we have, unanswered question we have, is whether our voters would support those two bonds so quickly.

A couple options that are available to us, there aren't many if the bonds fail. If the bond fails in February or if the bond, future bonds were to fail is portables which is what we're doing now. And

the other options, which we'd have to have a lot of community input on, are changing our method of service, double shifting, we're looking at year-round schools. At this point we already have about 20 percent of our kids in portables. We have 104 portables now, we're putting down 14 this summer, so that's to handle the growth that we know is going to come and is already -- actually is already here and is housed probably in areas that aren't real well suited for classrooms.

So that just brings me to the issue of urban holding and that just becomes increasingly important to us. We need to be able to work with the Counties -- the County and the Cities in managing the growth that we see projected by these changes to the urban growth boundary. The factors, you know, that play into it are our community, our community support for our schools and how quickly that growth happens. So I would just urge you to seriously consider the urban holding proposals that you've seen to help us with the growth that we see coming our way.

MORRIS: Lynn, urban holding language is one avenue, I'm going to ask again the same old question Mr. Lowry knows that I will ask: Why don't you from time to time, or repeatedly in fact, when an application for a subdivision comes to your school district to say whether or not you can provide for them, why don't you say no?

HICKS: Well, I tried that twice in Battle Ground and the -- I don't know who it is that oversees those hearings, asked me whether we had impact fees in place and I said yes, we do, and he said impact fees are the mitigation for these housing developments.

MORRIS: And you didn't appeal it to the Board?

HICKS: I didn't appeal it, no.

MORRIS: That was my chance. There was my chance.

PRIDEMORE: Your impact fees are maxed out now, aren't they?

HICKS: No, we're not at the maximum. We're not at the maximum. We just raised them, we just increased them. They were 1500, they're 3,000 now per single family and we --

PRIDEMORE: What was the maximum?

HICKS: The maximum was a little over 5,000. But we had a series of, you know, hearings and public input on what the fees should be and that was the recommended increase. So they're not at the max. But he actually wondered why I was there, he really didn't understand that so.

MORRIS: Which hearings examiner was that?

LOWRY: Was that inside the city of Battle Ground?

HICKS: Uh-huh. He has a German accent I think.

LOWRY: Okay. It would have been Forester then.

MORRIS: And it was -- and he was working for the City of Battle Ground or for --

LOWRY: I know the City of Battle Ground utilizes hearing examiners. As I've indicated to the Board in the past, we could change the current County policy that schools are an indirect concurrency requirement and therefore are not tested at development review stage, that would take a

change to current language in the comprehensive plan.

MORRIS: Well, then how much better is it for us to do to try to manage this issue with an urban holding. Because if you put a holding zone on it and you just repeatedly turn down bonds, I mean how would you ever have the standard for when you release it. At least when you talk about other infrastructure issues you are able to quantify that, but a bond measure for that particular area is so uncertain and I'd rather we just get rid of these impact fees and then you could clearly say no and it --

PRIDEMORE: Well, it begs the question, I mean, because if citizens can stop growth by not approving school bonds, then you will actually make I think it much more difficult for any school district to approve bonds as soon as citizens make that connection.

STANTON: You bet.

PRIDEMORE: So it kind of makes me wonder if we, and I've struggled with this because I empathize --

STANTON: I know you have. Me too. Right.

PRIDEMORE: -- with your coin that if school districts simply start recommending to us that we say no and we start saying no, then we have -- we will have a de facto moratorium across a great deal of the county and how do we ever get out of that bind.

MORRIS: Well, I'm not sure, but I'm convinced it's time for us to address this and to deal with it and it takes, it takes a whole number of venues of discussion all at the same time in order to be able

to do this because we will never get out of that in the Battle Ground School District, it just historically has been the case. And it's a little bit like as the Columbian described the geometry of the 134th Street/I-5/I-205 convergence, it is the nature of the size of your district so that it's like there isn't any place hardly they can expand anymore that doesn't impact Battle Ground. Very few areas in that whole county map. And the map of your district is just --

HICKS: It's huge.

MORRIS: It's amazing. And it's just fascinating the size of it. And I repeatedly say, well, if you don't collect the impact fees, you have not mitigated, therefore that is a fairly circular argument. I would love to have the chance to test that probably. And this is nothing new on my part, I've been saying this since 1996, I have been tilting a windmill it feels like, but that is -- I mean I don't feel, I don't feel that same kind of conundrum for the other school districts nearly so much as I feel it for Battle Ground because it is as though there is no way out.

HICKS: It's tough. I wish that we could say that we've turned a corner and we're heading, you know, we're heading upward. But we did have 58 percent on the first run of a bond --

MORRIS: And that is good. Very good.

HICKS: -- and the highest bond that we've ever run and we know that part of the reason that, that it failed was we didn't get the amount of voters out that we needed. We had less, less voters come out actually than we did when we passed our levy. And they were in the south part of the district which traditionally has been the part of our district that is always there and always supportive. So, you know, we've identified some of the things that we need to do to get it to pass the next time. You know, change is coming, change is slow, we'd like to be able to put up some schools that our

constituents really like, they can see that we can manage the money wisely and well, there's still some people in our district who don't believe we can do that, we'd love a chance to do that and, you know, who knows, that may be enough to help us turn the corner on that, but we're not there yet and so that's why we think that the urban holding language would help us if we could plan and do this kind of at a pace where we could hang in there together, we think that would really help.

MORRIS: The other side of that is I would hope that some of those new growth areas that are designated on the map that are in your school district would have a more positive attitude toward your ballot measures --

HICKS: And that's major, we do too. Absolutely.

MORRIS: -- they might even be able to push you over that additional two percent.

HICKS: Yeah, I agree.

MORRIS: I haven't looked at your precincts. Where were your greatest areas of failure on that?

HICKS: The north end.

MORRIS: Yeah. Okay. Oh, we do share your frustration and your concern. We do.

HICKS: I appreciate that. Todd.

MORRIS: Todd.

HORENSTEIN: Good afternoon.

HICKS: You'll have to switch spots with me.

HORENSTEIN: Okay.

PRIDEMORE: Why can't we put a third microphone in there.

MORRIS: I know it's pretty (inaudible).

HORENSTEIN: I just asked myself the same question.

LEE: You can take mine.

PRIDEMORE: And we never put a third one there either.

HORENSTEIN: Ask and I shall receive.

MORRIS: Ask and we shall provide.

HORENSTEIN: I don't have to move back now, do I. Hi, I'm Todd Horenstein with the Vancouver School District. We're just pleased to be at this juncture in the process and have a capital facilities plan before you for your consideration. Just a couple of comments about our plan. The school district, the Vancouver School District, is in the third and final phase of our building program and we do have some funds available to us to complete our construction work that will help accommodate our six-year growth. Fortunately as opposed to Battle Ground we're just slightly

ahead of our curve. The growth will continue over the 20 years so we will anticipate a shortage of space probably 10 years out for serving our growth and our community in Vancouver, but for the short term we, we feel that we're in pretty good position to accommodate the growth as it occurs.

The proposed boundary, urban boundary, has very minimal change for the Vancouver School District, 99.9 percent of our district is already within the urban growth boundary, the slight addition is for a very small corner in the northwest portion of our district which we abut Evergreen, or excuse me, Ridgefield, but the number of students that are projected to come from that area is relatively small, so it's not a significant impact for us in terms of changing the boundary for Vancouver. And then I think it's, for us it's a case of managing our growth in our district. It's a situation where we have significantly different demographics occurring. We are seeing some loss of population in the south end of the district, in the core of the city, but continued fairly rapid growth in the north end of the district up in the Salmon Creek, Ridgefield and even, or excuse me, Salmon Creek and Hazel Dell, Felida area of the district, so it becomes a bit of a balancing issue for us.

We did recently go through a fairly significant boundary change within our district, the school boundary within the school attendance areas to help balance that, but overall we are forecasting growth to continue. And I think Commissioner Stanton had a question about some of the reported decline in enrollment that we have expressed and I might make a comment about that. That was reported in terms of our budgeting process for next budget year which is based upon FTE, Full-Time Equivalence. We planned our growth based upon head count which is a different calculation, a different formula. The budget process only can address full-time units and we have -- we will see a slight decline in full-time units primarily because we are at the very tail end of this baby boom echo process and we are graduating high school classes larger than we're seeing entering kindergarten classes. So the fact that many high school kids are not a full-time student, some take

courses at other schools or they work and go to school, when you average it all out, you can have a decline in FTE and still see an increase in total enrollment and our forecast -- our capital facilities plan is based upon total enrollment which is forecasting slight growth and that would be generally the distinction between the two of why there's reported of a decline enrollment which of course means decline in resources, State resources.

STANTON: Thanks for the explanation. There's a note under the current facilities and current capacity that says "approximately 1250 students are currently housed in portable classrooms."

HORENSTEIN: Correct.

STANTON: And you talked about having funding available for housing those students as well as your six-year projected growth?

HORENSTEIN: Yes. We are making progress in being able to house those students in permanent facilities as our construction program completes itself over the next couple of years.

STANTON: Great.

SAHLER: Do you have any other questions for us?

MORRIS: No. Thank you very much.

SAHLER: Thank's very much for your consideration.

MORRIS: Next we have the Sheriff. He's our one service provider for whom instituting user fees

would be useless.

LUCAS: I tried to as I was sitting here listening to testimony tried to, tried to draw several analogies from the Sewer District but I just decided not to go there. In the spirit of good planning the Sheriff's Department has previously provided to you information in response to various, quote, growth management options presented by the Board as you review and update this comprehensive plan. My comments today build on our -- the November document we submitted in public testimony regarded projected growth and our operational functions. We've conducted a review of our current capital facilities, projected the capital facility additions that would be needed to accommodate and support the projected growth and our operational functions. The Sheriff's Office capital plan provides an inventory of existing facilities as well as a listing of additional capital facilities that are projected to be needed during the six year planning period including the approximate time frame attached and cost of additional facilities.

Today I'd like to focus my comments on two of the proposed additions. At first the basic conclusion reached during the development of these growth management options is that a new 500 bed detention facility will be required. A review of the Clark County master plan is underway to determine the feasibility of locating a new facility adjacent to the existing facility and potentially interconnecting the two. This configuration creates significant operational efficiency and savings and this efficiency could also be extended to associated court functions. Very preliminary investigations have been executed in this planning effort, but research to date would indicate that it is feasible to construct the facility of the identified size adjacent to the existing justice center. This construction would be interconnected and a new current -- connected to the new current center via overhead walkways. Several alternatives exist for additional associated court functions that may be required by the expansion. Preliminary investigation indicates that the campus can accommodate space and logistical requirements as they're identified. Additional support functions, property

storage and parking, also appear that they could be reasonably accommodated. A significant amount of work still needs to be executed in order to reach an initial conceptual master plan; however, early investigation would indicate the concept of expanding the criminal justice system on the current Clark County campus is a feasible alternative.

Second, the replacement of the existing central precinct at Highway 503 and 149th Street must be considered. The need for public meeting space as well as additional office space and the documented operational needs support the additional capacity. A preliminary architectural review indicates that 8600-square feet would be adequate. We have discussed a partnership with Public Works in regard to this facility. I thank you for the opportunity to inject public safety planning into the comprehensive growth process and appreciate all of the hard work and effort that has gone into your responsibility to build a comprehensive plan.

MORRIS: Any questions?

STANTON: In the funding sources for the capital facilities it doesn't indicate, and I'm not sure, I don't remember whether 6211 costs include capital. Are we able to charge back to the cities any of the cost of the capital? Do you know? Anybody?

LUCAS: Capital costs are a part of our 6211 cost formula so as we build those costs formulas they're added into the rate. And one of the difficulties with the current facility is that it was built with Federal dollars so consequently the capital piece we weren't able to build into the 6211 rates so any new facilities that we build absent, build absent the use of Federal dollars could well include the capital function and replying the bond, repaying the bonding costs.

MORRIS: Wasn't there some State money in that jail too?

LUCAS: Yes.

STANTON: So is it true if you get Federal funding, you can't incorporate it?

LUCAS: That's my understanding. I'm not --

STANTON: Or part of the real costs?

LUCAS: -- an accountant, but (inaudible) of the imagination.

STANTON: Okay, I get it.

LUCAS: But the County didn't invest the funds, therefore you can't build them into your (inaudible).

STANTON: Sure.

PRIDEMORE: 6211, however, we do charge user fees and we have had a couple of jurisdictions who have come to the conclusion that we're too expensive already, so I guess as we go through that consideration we need to figure what's the elasticity of demand and how much do we lose of other folks if we do incorporate those costs.

STANTON: Right. Shopping for other alternatives, I had that note too, but I just -- I didn't know the answer to the question about whether you could incorporate those as you billed back to the Cities. Certainly they're contributing.

LUCAS: Right. At least for the misdemeanor costs.

STANTON: Yes. Okay.

MORRIS: That is an interesting discussion about at what point does the jurisdiction decide that they would go build their own facility and operate it because I would think that's more expensive than people would realize really.

STANTON: Well, it's available capacity though. I think they've been taking advantage of available capacity in other cities or counties, at least we saw Camas I think it was and somebody else, Battle Ground sending folks out of the county.

LUCAS: Yes. Right.

STANTON: I don't think I have any other questions.

MORRIS: Another little perplexment for us. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: I think we do need to get some action out of that state.

STANTON: Did I just miss it or is the Sheriff's projects don't seem to be included in the County's capital facilities plan?

LEE: The 500-bed facility is in there. I do not know if the current version includes the central precinct that he mentioned.

MORRIS: Well, it's in the notebook.

LEE: Is it?

STANTON: Well, I was looking back here at the part that's on capital facilities plan, I didn't even see the 500-bed facility.

LOWRY: Yes, it is. Page 53. It is.

MORRIS: What page?

LOWRY: 53.

STANTON: It is there but in the summary the information's there.

LEE: In the 20-year comprehensive financial plan.

STANTON: But when you get back to the list of County buildings and other facilities, I didn't see it but I may just have missed it.

LEE: Let us confirm that and if it is not in there, we'll adjust the table appropriately. And the document behind the second tab, that's what you're referring to?

STANTON: Yes, the County's capital facility plan.

LEE: Financial plan 2003 to 2008?

STANTON: Right. Behind the second tab and the listing of County buildings and other facilities on Page 12 I didn't see a reference to the 500-bed facility there.

MORRIS: Neither do I.

STANTON: None of his requests are there.

LEE: Probably updated the one document and not the second.

STANTON: Just kind of makes a difference in the bottom line. \$80 million worth of difference.

MORRIS: Is WSU here now?

VALENTER: I didn't want to mess with the Sheriff so I thought I'd wait to come up. Good afternoon and thank you for allowing the testimony. Thank you also for the scheduling, that is quite helpful when there's a time that we know to be here. We have good news. Oh, I'm sorry, Lynn Valenter, Washington State University, Vancouver.

MORRIS: And you have good news?

VALENTER: I have good news. We are currently evaluating 20-year growth for a supplemental environmental impact statement that we are required to undergo. As a part of that we're doing detailed traffic analysis and that is the issue which my comments today rely upon. The capital facilities plan such as it's presented will meet all of our growth needs without any need for a change

or revision. So I guess to present it the other way, we conform with what you're providing, not the other way around, but we have no issues with that. Our analysis also shows that we will meet level-of-service and concurrency with the growth that we're projecting within our supplemental environmental impact statement. So the two biggies that I think you want to hear about are good to go.

The remaining issue is the same one that I brought to your attention when I testified back in December that the model upon which all of the assumptions are based still reflects a 5,000 student population level. Our current approved EIS reflects an 8600 student population level and our current growth anticipates that 5,000 is probably about a third of the level of students we'll have within the 20-year planning horizon. We were directed to discuss the concerns with staff. Staff believes, and I'm paraphrasing here, I'm sure they can do it much better than I do, the model is a macro model and they don't believe that trying to modify a macro model for micro concerns is proper.

We -- the underlying concern that's before us today is that the intersection at 134th is currently being designed for Washington State Department of Transportation, it's under design to be able to have the capacity to serve the growth in the area as well as our student growth. There may be other ways of working with that, but I guess I'm back to my original point that if you're going to rely on a model, the more accurate you can make the underlying model, the better off you are. The model is a land use model, we are a different kind of land use. But to the extent that we've done some pretty thoughtful planning it seems that it would benefit this community to capture that within the model that -- the RTM model that both the County and the State rely on when developing long-term capital facilities. Those are, I guess, my primary points. I would welcome any questions or discussion that you might like to have.

PRIDEMORE: I'm not a traffic engineer so I don't know, I know the 134th Street interchange is the improvements of that are going to be fairly significant and substantial and I wonder how much larger it could be in order to accommodate what you're talking about or if what we need to focus on is secondary, tertiary access means to get into WSU recognizing that 134th can only become so big.

VALENTER: I'm not a traffic engineer either so it's probably good that you and I are talking. Conceptually it appears as though a second lane going from I-205, going from 134th southbound onto I-205 is the primary need. They're anticipating one lane and it's a fly something or another down. If that were two lanes it appears that to a large extent that would handle the expected volumes of traffic. We will -- we have also had some discussion with WSDOT and will continue to do so, but it also kind of comes back to the basic model and if every time we're going to be modeling things for 20 years we're relying on this model, it makes some sense to modify the model. But we are pursuing those discussions. And there may be other issues, but that intersection becomes an intersection of statewide significance so it becomes more of a State issue than a County issue, but by having models that showed that we've already captured all of the potential land use need, my opinion is that we're not helping ourselves.

PRIDEMORE: And I know this is completely outside of anything WSU wants or projects or anything, but it starts to make me wonder if a residential kind of program of some sort where, I know, I know, I know, I knew you were going to react that way, but just right now everybody has got to drive in and out of WSU and if it's more cost effective -- rather than trying to deal with all of that traffic if it's more cost effective to deal with our land use planning and maybe it's not something on campus residential, but something around it.

VALENTER: I can just say I'm a huge fan of free enterprise in the market system.

PRIDEMORE: And there are a lot of other people out there who are too. And maybe, I don't know if that -- the idea here is that transportation, you know, you don't just build transportation systems to accommodate, you know, wherever people want to go, but try to provide alternatives where they can access where they want to go more easily, more cost efficiently, and that's all I'm--

VALENTER: Well, no, and that's a, certainly a worthy discussion despite my personal abhorrence for the issue. I do have concerns, though, about you can't just do that in isolation. And we are not like an urban metropolitan campus in many ways and without a pretty high level of underlying support you may end up creating more rather than less because then you've got 24/7 access with parking and other things like that. I mean the transportation engineers have a way to quantify this and it may be that in the very long term that's part of the solution, but it won't be all of the solution. Certainly not in the kind of near term.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. And again I don't -- I'm not suggesting necessarily you do residential on campus that's even a WSU thing, it is marketplace and it's just how we zone around the campus. I think what's going to happen regardless of what we sit here and theorize about today is you're going to become an urban campus, you will be surrounded by urban area, and kind of planning that, well, you've always talked about the campus, I don't remember what you called it now, but university campus.

STANTON: The rezoning of--

PRIDEMORE: Zoning.

STANTON: -- the facility out there?

VALENTER: Metropolitan.

PRIDEMORE: Something. But where we really target what, how do we deal with the land use around the university.

VALENTER: And it's not that we're just speculating on growth, I mean the same demographics that the school systems are working with in terms of growth are, you know, four years later to ten years later, the demographics that we deal with and statewide there's a \$30,000 shortage of higher education slots by the year 2010, so it's not unrealistic that we would be trying to meet that need in a variety of ways.

STANTON: And we'll meet the transportation needs I think in a variety of ways as well. Part of it can be demand management because the timing of your students arriving is not exactly the time that the rest of the system is stressed and so, you know, working together at some point I think we can manage a good piece of it without having to just build it all in concrete.

VALENTER: Yeah. For example our a.m. and p.m. peak hour profile has been very different than what was anticipated when the campus first opened.

STANTON: Right. And that's a good thing.

MORRIS: There's a hesitancy I have to plan too much around school transportation issues because I'm always struck by how much quicker traffic moves when school is not in session and that just brings to mind how much traffic is indeed caused by people going to school. And we've talked about limiting the amount of parking that you can have for a school building to try to cut down on the amount of high schoolers who drive to work, but it's amazing, you know, you can just get

around much better. And we always measure concurrency issues and capacity issues when school is in session and I suppose that's right, but essentially what we do is we spend a lot of money to deal with that coming and going from schools by the size, by the way we size our facilities so.

PRIDEMORE: These are the times people complain about.

MORRIS: They are the times that people complain about. They sure are.

VALENTER: We -- just to kind of close the loop, we would look for direction on how to proceed because I do think that again my opinion is that the community is not being served properly by the current level of the model. And so I'm not sure where you want to go with this, if you want staff to work with WSDOT that may assist in the very short term on this specific project which has a huge trickle effect to all of us that live in Clark County, I mean that intersection is critical, but I do feel that in the long term if we can get the model revised it will just provide a reasonable basis for planning and we'll be glad to work with whomever or whatever needs to occur. We have a great deal of detailed analysis we've had to do that is as of right now it's current.

PRIDEMORE: I'd definitely like to see that. And I think particularly in this area it seems that let's say we have consistently underestimated what was going to occur in that area and so making certain that the model is adequately and accurately reflecting the future would sure be nice so it's not something we end up dealing with every three or four years finding out that we've under planned.

STANTON: You're not in the discussion right now as to what happens out there at the, at the Junction?

VALENTER: After my last testimony I was directed to work with staff to try and incorporate or to

address my concerns I think was how it was depicted. Staff has a different opinion than WSU has and so at this point I believe the direction is that we will let the macro model stand and we work with it on a project-by-project basis. And staff is not combative but they're just working with a different level. And they're traffic experts and I'm not, but I look more at the outcomes. I appreciate the value of a model, but to me a model is used to make decisions and I think better decisions will be made if the model is more accurate.

MORRIS: It depends on how much difference the model makes. I guess I, I have a limited, a limited trust in models to begin with because after eight years of talking about models here and models there and seeing the predictions of models and these are absolutely going to work right and then they never do, I guess it would depend on whether or not you spent the time reworking the model for an additional 5,000 students that might yield, I don't know how many trips you'd actually get out of that that would be involved in peak hour traffic as opposed to just using demand management kinds of strategies that Commissioner Stanton, you know, I guess I don't have an objection to it, I don't have much faith that it will make much difference.

VALENTER: That's the difficulty with any long-term model is the uncertainty, but if we take something that we know is undersizing, I mean current levels are at 5,000, we're projecting closer to 15,000 within a 20 year, so the scale is actually fairly significant. Again the good news is the capital facilities plan from the County accommodates that.

MORRIS: But are those 20,000 trips a day? I mean how many trips are those?

VALENTER: No, they're about though. We currently have 1149 reserved, we would anticipate the additional need would be total 2600 to 3400, so you're talking between 1500 and 2300 peak hour trips, so it's fairly -- it's substantial.

PRIDEMORE: I guess that's the bigger question. I don't know. I agree with you on the modeling thing, that's gotten to be so frustrating to me. I'd love to be able to predict perfectly. The bigger question to me would be are we undersizing the facility from what we can reasonably expect over the next 20 years. And Lynn mentioned specifically, you know, whether this flyover should be one lane or two lane, well, that's a question that would be nice to look at and have the answer not be, well, the model says we don't need to, but some more thought out rationale for why it should be one size or another.

STANTON: Especially if WSU has pockets full of money that they're coming in to help build a larger --

MORRIS: You bet.

PRIDEMORE: They always bring a lot of money.

VALENTER: We can assure you that we do not have pockets full of money.

STANTON: Oh, Lynn.

VALENTER: I (inaudible) that's a surprise.

MORRIS: Neither do we.

PRIDEMORE: But if we sell the Amphitheater and split the money with them.

VALENTER: This was meant to be a low key testimony.

STANTON: I guess --

MORRIS: You know, that's a key issue so what do you -- how do you pay for it if you find that maybe we do need two and then -- I mean what are the requests from WSU that we reserve the capacity or that perhaps somebody else takes it up and then you can't use the trips anyway. I don't --

VALENTER: Well, it is a complex issue, but I guess right now the intersection is being built with State money and the State money has it undersized. And it's on a project list based on two-year old data that wasn't particularly accurate to begin with.

PRIDEMORE: This is you guys are saying it's undersized in your beliefs and their beliefs are that it's not undersized?

VALENTER: Their beliefs are that they've designed it based on the model numbers and that the model numbers it's not undersized. We know we have an EIS that says you can go to 8600 students and that's still only about half of what we think. So we're not trying to be overly aggressive, we're trying to be realistic, but mostly just to call out our assumptions, but their point is that they're relying on a model that is the same model that Clark County uses that has 5,000 students for the University.

PRIDEMORE: That's one thing we know, our transportation modeling is always inaccurate.

MORRIS: And old. And all of our numbers are old by now. They're mildewing.

VALENTER: Right. But in 1993 we said 8600 students and that was approved and the model still in 2004 shows 5,000 students. So I mean where would you like me to go with this, I mean, short of leaving but --

STANTON: I think the other part that's hard to figure out is how many of those -- I mean the number can vary dramatically whether you have full-time students or part-time students because of the number of trips. If you're only going up there to take one class or two classes like I've done in the past, I count as a trip every time; if you had all part-time students you could have a heck of a lot more trips than if you had all full-time students who went at one time and stayed through the day, excuse me, and then left. So there's a lot of variation just in planning your student level.

VALENTER: And the truth again about modeling is over time it's less accurate, but we at this point have a reasonably stable level of full-time to part-time students. Again that could change, but over the past seven or eight years it's been pretty stable, so we have reasonable levels of forecasting that.

MORRIS: Okay. This is seven months past the time when I think you had initially asked for that update. Mr. Lee, what's the trouble with updating the model?

LEE: I am not sure. I have not been party to these conversations. If it's the regional transportation model that is maintained by the RTC --

MORRIS: There we go. We just based on our data. Mr. Dust, you want to jump in.

LEE: If it is the concurrency model, then it's really Mr. Schulte in Public Works that are responsible for that discussion.

MORRIS: Who have you been talking to, let me put it that way?

VALENTER: Evan Dust.

MORRIS: Evan.

LEE: Evan, where are you?

PRIDEMORE: Fix it. 4:00, Evan, 4:00.

DUST: For the record Evan Dust, Long-Range Planning. Yes, we have been working with WSU on trying to address this issue. Our first meeting that happened shortly after --

MORRIS: We don't need all that, just tell us. She says that the staff response has been this is a micro and that you are modeling on a macro level. Tell us what is in your mind the difference in why it is impractical or maybe it is not impractical to add in additional trips for WSU.

DUST: It is possible to add in additional trips for WSU, the result of the model may not match the traffic analysis that WSU's consultant has prepared because the approach that the model takes is regional in nature and considers all competing institutions that may have enrollment, whereas WSU's study is based on their particular master plan scenario. So the difference is one of scale. They feel very, very comfortable stating how many students they expect to have and how many trips they expect from those students and where those trips end up because they're only dealing with them with WSU as an institution, whereas the model has to deal with WSU as an institution, Clark College as an institution, Portland State as an institution, Portland Community College as an

institution. So the model because it's a shared model regionally takes all that demand for student trips and spreads it over all of those institutions.

PRIDEMORE: So this is -- is this you're using Metroscope?

DUST: This is a regional model issue.

MORRIS: It's worse.

DUST: A component of the regional model is the journey to university or college campuses, it's a component of the model.

PRIDEMORE: And then how that --

DUST: It's an issue --

PRIDEMORE: So WSDOT is deciding how to build the I-205/I-5 interchange area based on a regional model that says this number of people are going to be going to college here?

DUST: They're using that as an indication. You only use the model as an indication of the level of capacity you have to provide.

PRIDEMORE: So how does this compare to say Steve Schulte's model about concurrency in that area?

DUST: In that area Steve's -- the concurrency model is a micro model. It looks at the world the

same way as WSU's consultants would look at the world, that the world exists within that finite area that the model -- that the concurrency model deals with.

MORRIS: Well, since Mr. Schulte's model seems much more relevant than anybody else's model when we size facilities, it seems reasonable that we would depend on Mr. Schulte's model. And, Mr. Schulte, how many trips do you have built into your model for WSU?

PRIDEMORE: Look at that look on his face.

MORRIS: Oh, look, he's happy.

PRIDEMORE: He was really mad when we were bashing the models here.

SCHULTE: Commissioners, one big difference is the time horizon in the models. The concurrency model is in essence a three-year model. We only model up to the time of build-out of all the developments that have reservations. Evan's model is a 20-year model so there's a big --

LEE: It's not Evan's model, it's the regional transportation agency's model.

SCHULTE: Excuse me.

PRIDEMORE: But what we're talking about here --

MORRIS: They say they build it on ours. See, this is what I said earlier.

PRIDEMORE: There's a huge difference. I mean just logically if you put to somebody and you say

in 20 years there's going to be 40,000 people going into college in this huge multi-county area, tell me how big to build this particular road versus in 20 years there's going to be 15,000 people in this location, tell me how big to build this particular road, that's a huge difference and that's what you're struggling with over, over here. And so I'm curious, which does WSDOT ask themselves when they decide how large to make a facility and for that matter what does Clark County look at?

SCHULTE: The State, the State could have taken our concurrency model and done a pro forma type of analysis, booked in 20 years of growth, whatever their design horizon was, put in a larger WSU campus, they could have done that. I don't know that they have.

MORRIS: Could we ask them to?

SCHULTE: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: So you could take a specific WSU campus, this specific geographic location you're going to have this many --

SCHULTE: Yes, you could. Yes, you could. And much of the concurrency modeling work we've done up in Salmon Creek dealing with the failures and the moratoriums up there we've actually looked 20 years out with our concurrency model.

PRIDEMORE: And we made mistakes with our inputs to that; is that right? I mean we put in lower figures than anticipated?

MORRIS: Well, he is saying that environmentally constrained lands wouldn't develop.

PRIDEMORE: Right. Well, that's kind of what I mean. So we end up in a greater -- that's exactly what I'm getting to here is if Lynn is right and we're putting in a lower number here than what's actually going to occur, we're going to have a problem not very far down the road. So our concern is very legitimate and I would like it -- hope that WSDOT is going to build an appropriate facility for what's really going to happen out there.

SCHULTE: What's in the concurrency model right now is the 1149 trips for their current campus size and that's based on the developer agreement from four or five years ago.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, but we're not talking about the concurrency model here per se, we're talking about --

STANTON: (Inaudible) 20 year.

MORRIS: We're trying to talk about how big a ramp ought to be, a flyover, that's sort of what I think we need to talk about, and if the data isn't in whatever it's in to make it big enough, I think we ought to ask to add it. Have I got a second vote?

PRIDEMORE: Obviously you shouldn't run that for your concurrency program because you're using it for a different purpose, but somewhere we need to project specifically in this area what is the traffic impact going to be. It doesn't sound like the regional model is getting us there.

MORRIS: It may not just be geography heading up there or geometry, it may be the models --

PRIDEMORE: Appropriations.

MORRIS: No.

SCHULTE: I think it's also important to note the issues probably aren't just isolated to that one interchange at 205 and 134th.

MORRIS: I'm sure they're not.

SCHULTE: If you have two southbound on-ramps, you have to be concerned can the main line handle the feed from the two ramps and it just -- the issues ripple on down.

DUST: I think as staff we've heard your direction and we'll follow it. Thank you.

MORRIS: Wow. Okay. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: He dismissed us.

MORRIS: That's responsive. Thank you.

VALENTER: Am I dismissed now? Way to go, Evan.

MORRIS: Now you came here with good news and you left with better news. Okay. That brings us to the end of our formalized segmented hearing today principally from jurisdictions and now we have a few minutes left to hear from other people and other speakers and I know that some of you are here just exactly for that. We know John Karpinski is here for that and there are some other faces that have been here for a while. I don't know if you were just enamored with the conversation and wanted to hang out or whether you have something to say, but we'll take John first and then

anyone else who would like to thereafter.

KARPINSKI: I figured I'd provide a little color after everybody else is all dressed up fancy today. I'm not sure which microphone to use.

MORRIS: Anything that works.

KARPINSKI: Anything that works. Well, I normally project so it doesn't usually matter too much. My name is John Karpinski here on behalf of CCNRC here to talk about the capital facilities plan. Some of this is issues that you've heard before but I want to talk specifically and mainly about the summary report. Ironically the summary report seemed to be longer than the report that we got, but I'll talk about the summary report.

Still no mention about the Federal/State roads and how much they cost. The Draft EIS said, you know, we had a \$1.2 billion need for State and Federal roads and all of a sudden -- and only \$200 million worth of funding and then all of a sudden that issue just sort of disappeared and hasn't been followed up on. I think that's a requirement of GMA to discuss what happened to that billion dollar shortfall of roads and I think that's a requirement of GMA that you discuss that. I understand that there's maybe not necessarily a lot you can do about it, but I don't think ignoring it and just is the proper methodology of dealing with that.

I'm not sure, secondly, you can have a legally defensible plan without a Battle Ground capital facilities plan. I think you properly gave them six months to get their act together. And if you look at the majority of where the new growth is going, that's where it's going and you don't have a capital facilities plan to support it and now what are we going to do. And as the saying goes Houston, we have a problem. I don't think you can give it to Battle Ground. I don't think you can use urban

holding to cure it. And I don't think it's appropriate to shift it to other jurisdictions because the other jurisdictions don't have capital facilities plans to support shifting it to the other jurisdictions. I think your only option is to limit the amount of growth, which is what I said we should do to begin with. I don't see what we're going to do if the funding falls short of the needs element which is referred to at Page 69 of the summary report. Maybe it's there and in another document that wasn't in the package of materials that was submitted to me, it could very well exist and it's just not around and I haven't seen it, but that is a legal requirement of GMA. What do we do if we run out of money and that seems to be kind of a main issue of what we're doing regarding capital facilities, so we do -- I would like to see the wording on that as to what we do in that case because that seems to be very germane regarding capital facilities.

And the fourth legal issue I see is what do we do about Vancouver. You keep giving them more stuff, they clearly say they don't want it, they don't want to take it, and are you going to end up shoving this growth down their throat when their capital facilities plan says that they can't handle it and it's really an interesting legal question.

Let me talk a little bit about what I got out of the capital facilities plan. And I think you have to put this into a context and that context is 1.83 which is the growth rate and which is 70 percent of that growth is for immigration. This is not local people having babies for houses, these are other people moving here, this is the growth rate in terms of immigration that we had in the bad old days of the peak growth, we're subsidizing people to move here. Whether you think that's a good idea, bad idea or whatever, that's what we're doing. And the 70 percent comes from your staff, comes from OFM. Basically the difference between the 1.5 figure and the 1.7 figure is almost entirely immigration. So you decided to have more people move here. That was your policy choice. You've decided to become more of a bedroom community. You've decided to have more houses than the METRO.

Now what's the -- what happened as a result of that. If you look at Page 64 and 65 what happened to the level-of-service in our community. And I'm concerned about the level-of-service on roads not only for livability of our community but also jobs. I've never heard a major employer come here and say I've come to your community because your roads here are really bad. So let's go through and look at the Camas level-of-service. 56 percent of the roads have a declining level-of-service. Clark County, 26 percent decline. Battle Ground, sure not appearing in this film. La Center, 51 percent. Ridgefield, 60 percent. Vancouver who you want to give a lot of growth to who if Battle Ground doesn't show up who you're probably going to give more growth to, 90 percent of their roads decline. Washington State, 33 percent. Washougal, 39 percent.

Also, which is interesting, pay attention to the little details. In the transportation analysis Pages 10 through 13 there's 46 roads that are now bumped up in their arterial status which in my hat as land use guy for the neighbors, if neighbors always find it interesting when the road in front of their house is bumped up in arterial status because all of a sudden things get built in front of their houses because it's the road is defined to hold a lot more traffic than it's normally built to handle and most of these are just being redefined to a greater status and not because that's actually road improvements attached to these. Some of these have road improvements attached to them, but most of these are just being miraculously defined to hold more cars. So in addition to the level-of-service these particular road sections are just being defined to now miraculously hold more cars.

So what are we doing to jobs if we're letting all the roads go bad. Your Draft Environmental Impact Statement said you're hurting jobs. We already have a 20 percent vacancy rate for commercial and a 20 percent vacancy rate for industrial. Now granted those numbers are from November of last year, I don't have a more current figure, I'm hoping they're better, they're probably better for office space, but they're probably not better for a lot of other things. I have seen an article which I've sent to you which I hope you've read from the Oregonian which talked about a study that says a tight

urban growth boundary gives in-fill incentives to things like Albertson's which would normally leapfrog to new development because it's normally cheaper to just build a new building than it is to in-fill an existing building, but right now we're seeing things like an empty Albertson's at 503 and 500 which I'm sure happened as a result of a new building that Gramor or somebody came in and said, God, we need this new building, we're going to give you some jobs and they built it and then they emptied out the building there. We, you know, we didn't get new jobs, we just moved the existing jobs we had to a place that's harder for the community to serve. I'm concerned about jobs and I see the capital facilities plan moving things to a place that's harder for us -- harder and more expensive for us to serve and I think that's difficult.

Moving away from roads to schools, the Battle Ground schools can we really consider things to be reasonably funded. Again at Page 46 of your report, your own staff report indicates that the bond issues are not likely to pass voter approval. If you can't get school approval, you can't add all of this residential. And most of this residential -- most of the growth for Battle Ground is residential. It's considered, quote, highly unlikely, unquote, in the staff report that bond issues would pass to support this urban growth boundary. How can you support this from a capital facilities point of view if the funding is highly unlikely, quote, unquote. The answer is to me you can't. Is getting an \$80 million bond issue reasonably likely in the next six years in this environment. I mean the policy choice is up to you, but I think it's going to be tough. The choice is we're going to be releasing felons if we aren't, is that reasonably likely. It's at Page 73 of this report. I don't know, that's your call, but I think it's going to be tough.

Water rights. Battle Ground, this is really interesting, at Page 14, you know, we're having trouble all of these jurisdictions can't get new water rights for their water and we have groundwater for all our water rights, Battle Ground future recruitment of industrial development is not expected until Battle Ground obtains a large supply of water. In other words Battle Ground can't get jobs until

they get a reliable water supply. Well, then how come we're adding this much residential to Battle Ground. If their water supply is so tenuous they can't get jobs, then why are we doubling the size of Battle Ground with houses. Riddle me this, can anybody explain this one to me. It doesn't make sense from a capital facilities point of view.

Now again phasing, I don't think setting things aside in urban reserve is a cure-all to all these problems. I think you have to have a plan. I don't think you can go ahead without a Battle Ground plan and then say we'll just throw everything into urban reserve and I don't think that will cure it, mainly because I think Battle Ground could then just annex everything and totally circumvent whatever you did. I don't think there's a bulletproof way of getting around that. If there was I'd love to see it, I'd love to help work with your attorney on it, but I don't think there's a way that you can circumvent it to make sure that it really works because annexation will get around almost any way of dealing with an urban reserve issue that I'm aware of. I mean maybe somebody's come up with a bulletproof plan that I'm not aware of, but I think you have a problem with that, otherwise I'm a big supporter of urban reserve. I think in the right spot it can be the appropriate solution.

So in conclusion, and I know it's the favorite thing you like me to say, you have to balance three things here which is the growth level, the level-of-level and the amount of money in new taxes that you want people to pay. What we did hear is after six months I expected to come back and say we decided that we wanted to add this 9,000 acres, this 9,000, 8, 9, 10,000 acres, whatever it is now, and this is going to need this many new roads, parks, schools, and this is the price tag for it. We didn't do that, we didn't want to put the price tag on it. What we did instead is to say, well, here's what we're -- here's what we're going to do, here's what we can afford, and then we're just going to -- we're not going to know, no, don't tell us how much it's going to cost, we're just going to figure out how much we're going to pay and then we're just going to see how bad everything is going to get instead. Okay. I don't really think that's a good way of capital facilities planning. I think that

just leads to bad roads, bad schools, more bedrooms and higher taxes.

Your staff has already said that we can fit the growth that we originally projected inside existing boundaries. Why don't you come up with a plan that says what things will look like if you do that. Why don't you come up with a capital facilities plan and then compare those two. What would be the harm in doing that. And let's have a real compare and contrast those two options and have an honest discussion and comparison of those two alternatives because I think it would open some eyes. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MORRIS: Questions? Thank you.

KARPINSKI: Thank you.

MORRIS: Is there anyone else here who would like to speak this afternoon? Anyone else who would like to speak? Well, if not then we will adjourn our meeting for today. And our next public meeting on this issue is when, Mr. Lee?

PRIDEMORE: The 27th.

LEE: Yeah. To review the schedule, on the 27th we'll focus on the docket recommendations from the Planning Commission. There's also a separate hearing on the Section 30 plan recommendation from the Planning Commission. August 3rd we have only a two-hour slot available for follow-up on capital facilities. August 4th we have I think all afternoon and about three hours in the evening booked to continue this discussion and begin to get into further testimony on the proposed land use map and other issues that people are interested in.

MORRIS: Great. Thank you. We're adjourned.

(Hearing adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)